TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND ACHIEVING STYLES
OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LEADERS

A dissertation presented to
the faculty of
the College of Education of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Danita M. Brown
June 2007
This dissertation titled
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND ACHIEVING STYLES
OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LEADERS

by
DANITA M. BROWN

has been approved for
the Department of Counseling and Higher Education
and the College of Education by

Marc Cutright
Associate Professor of Higher Education

Renée A. Middleton
Dean, College of Education
ABSTRACT

BROWN, DANITA M., Ph.D., June 2007, Higher Education

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND ACHIEVING STYLES
OF FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LEADERS (127 pp.)

Director of Dissertation: Marc Cutright

The purpose of this study was to assess aspects, behaviors and characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership among fraternity and sorority leaders. This research examined the relationship between their self-described leadership behaviors and those perceived by their followers. The relationship between their transformational leadership behaviors and their achieving styles was investigated, and achieving style differences based on gender was also examined.

During the winter quarter of 2007, each fraternity and sorority president who was in office during the fall quarter of 2006 at Ohio University was asked to respond to statements on the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) and the online version of the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI). Additionally, four members from each president’s chapter or council were systematically selected and asked to complete the Student LPI-Observer form on behalf of the president. Finally, to complement the researcher’s statistical analysis, four separate focus group interview sessions were convened.

Thirty fraternity and sorority presidents were eligible to participate; 16 were males and 14 were females. Thirteen males and 12 females returned completed surveys.
Results were analyzed using independent $t$-tests to look at differences between individual groups. Correlations between each of the Student LPI and ASI scales were also run.

Fraternity and sorority presidents who were in office during Fall Quarter 2006 used transformational leadership styles.

Fraternity and sorority chapter/council members depicted their presidents as leaders who display and use transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics.

Both males and females preferred to employ the same leadership behaviors and styles when leading their organization.

Male and female presidents prefer to utilize different ASI achieving styles to accomplish their goals.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Leadership begins where management ends, where the systems of rewards and punishments, control and scrutiny, give way to innovation, individual character, and the courage of convictions. Your challenge is to lead your staff to get extraordinary things done. This requires inspiring and motivating your staff toward a common purpose and building a cohesive and spirited team. (Johnson & Johnson, 1989, p.168).

Background of the Study

What is a leader? What is leadership? Are leaders born, or are they made? Does effective leadership originate in a person or in a set of actions and behaviors? These questions have been asked for many years and by numerous scholars (McLean & Weitzel, 1992; Johnson & Johnson, 1994; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). “The concepts leader and leadership have been defined in more different ways than almost any other concept associated with group dynamics” (Johnson & Johnson, 1994, p.168).

“Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (Burns, 1978, p.2). Bass and Stogoill (1990) describe leadership as being one of the world’s oldest preoccupations. Most people think they understand the word “leadership” but there is no agreed upon definition of what it means.

There are many different definitions of leadership. It can be an art, a process, or an attribute. Various researchers have focused on the physical traits, or behaviors of the leader; others have studied the relationships between leaders and followers; still others have studied how aspects of the situation affect the ways leaders act. Some believe
leadership to be a personality trait inherited by those who possess it. Others believe it can be learned. There are those who say leadership is determined by characteristics of the individual and those who believe it is the elements of the situation that make the person a leader. Today, researchers are looking at interactions between the individual and situational variables.

Leadership has been identified with group process and group movement. It has been seen as having to do with getting followers to comply with wishes of the leader by using force, power, position, manipulation or persuasion. Terms like influences, relationships, power differentials, influence on goal achievement, role differentiation, reinforcement, initiation of structure and “perceived attributions of behavior that are consistent with what the perceivers believe leadership to be” (Bass, 1990, p.6) are used when defining leadership.

Bernard Bass (1990) defines leadership as “an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situations and the perceptions and expectations of the members” (p.19). James Burns (1978) defines leadership as “the reciprocal process of mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic, political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers” (p.425). Another definition calls leadership a process of moving a group of people in some direction through non-coercive means (Kotter, 1988).

Some view leadership as having a moral dimension. Leaders are people who bring about change. They see what is needed and what is right. In addition they know how to motivate people and mobilize resources to accomplish mutual goals (Cronin, 1989).
Kouzes and Posner (2002) look at how leaders use leadership to mobilize others to want to get extraordinary things done in organizations and how leadership creates climates in which people turn challenging opportunities into remarkable successes. Leaders are seen as people who empower others. They create options and opportunities. They enable their followers to become leaders. However, to understand leaders, one must understand followers. The two terms are interconnected and whether one is a leader or follower depends upon the situation. The leader/follower connection poses a series of questions such as:

- How does communication between leaders and followers work?
- What are the rights and duties of leaders and of followers?
- Do you have to have a follower in order to be a leader?

The research on leadership has been underlined with the sometimes implicit, sometimes explicit assumption that leadership is causally related to organizational performance. “Through an analysis of leadership behaviors, characteristics, or styles, the argument has been made that more effective leaders can be selected or trained or, alternatively, the situation can be configured to provide for enhanced leader and, consequently, organizational effectiveness” (Pfeffer, 1978, p.13). We are all involved in the leadership process, and we are all capable of being effective leaders.

The various definitions of leadership can help us appreciate the multitude of factors that affect leadership, as well as different perspectives from which to view it. Leadership can be viewed from various disciplines: political science addresses power and influence; business management sees leadership as effectiveness in outcomes or emphasizes supervisor-subordinate relationships, history looks to the influence of key
figures during significant times or when leading major social movements; and psychology or sociology looks at individuals and groups as they interact. Leadership is discussed in terms of political, military, psychological and sociological experiences and is dispersed throughout all segments of our society--government, business, communities, universities, social agencies, professions, and so on.

**Statement of the Problem**

The research problem was to assess aspects, behaviors and characteristics of transformational leadership and achieving styles of fraternity and sorority leaders, and to show the relationship between their self described leadership behaviors and how those behaviors are perceived by their followers.

**Research Questions**

1. What are fraternity and sorority leaders’ self-described leadership behaviors and achieving styles?

2. Are there significant differences between how these leaders describe their leadership styles and their followers’ descriptions of these styles?

3. What is the relationship between fraternity and sorority leaders’ self-reported achieving styles and their self-assessed leadership behaviors?

4. What is the relationship between the followers’ assessment of fraternity and sorority leaders’ behaviors and those leaders’ achieving styles?

5. Do fraternity and sorority leaders have different achieving styles according to gender?
Research Hypotheses

Null Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. There is no relationship between self described leadership behaviors (Student LPI) and achieving styles (ASI) of fraternity and sorority leaders.

2. There are no significant differences in how fraternity and sorority leaders describe their leadership behaviors and their followers’ description of these behaviors on the Student LPI.

3. There are no significant differences by gender in preferred leadership behaviors of fraternity and sorority leaders on each of the Student LPI practices.

4. There are no significant differences by gender in achieving styles of selected leaders on each of the ASI scales.

Purpose of the Study

Numerous studies have been conducted that examine the leadership styles of adults, specifically managers and supervisors. Although leadership development and leadership styles have been researched by student affairs professionals, and various theories and models have been proposed, little is known about characteristics, styles or behaviors of college students—fraternity and sorority leaders.

The purpose of this research study was to assess aspects, behaviors and characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership among fraternity and sorority leaders. This research strived to show the relationship between their self described leadership behaviors and how those behaviors are perceived by their followers.
The relationship between their transformational leadership behaviors and their achieving styles were investigated, and achieving style differences based on gender was also examined.

_Significance of the Study_

Realizing the disparity in literature regarding the relationship of involvement in fraternity and sorority organizations and student leadership behavior, despite the widely held perception that participation in fraternity and sorority life improves members’ aptitude for leadership, this study was exploratory in nature. In particular, this study attempted to link the massive amounts of literature on the outlook of fraternity and sorority leaders and leadership development.

By examining fraternity and sorority leaders’ achieving styles with the Lipman-Blumen, Handley-Isaksen, and Leavitt (1983) achievement styles framework, student affairs professionals are more informed, and thus, better able to work with these student leaders. Explicitly, having gained insight into how student leaders prefer to approach tasks, student affairs professionals working with fraternity and sorority leaders can create advising and programming that make the most of the student leaders’ achievement profile abilities. Programming that is compatible with the fraternity and sorority leaders’ achievement profiles may enhance their motivation to accomplish goals.

Subsequently, student affairs professionals will be able to design more intentional, developmental programming to meet the needs of student leaders, particular those members of fraternities and sororities.
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

Delimitations of the Study

This study was restricted to fraternity and sorority presidents who presided at a particular time and members of chapters and governing councils at Ohio University. This study was limited to fraternity and sorority presidents who presided over a chapter or governing council that had a membership consisting of five or more members at Ohio University during fall quarter 2006. Due to the on-site sampling of fraternity and sorority leaders, the number of participants was small. In addition, student leaders described their own perceptions, and the results of this study were reliant upon the understanding of themselves, and their willingness to be open and honest about beliefs regarding their leadership behaviors and achieving styles. Therefore, further study is needed before generalizations can be made to a broader population of student leaders.

Limitations of the Study

1. Participation from the Latina sorority, and two of the six Ohio University National Pan-Hellenic Council, Incorporated, Greek organizations was not possible because their total chapter membership consists of less than five members. Participation from one Interfraternity Council (IFC) fraternity was not possible because the organization was suspended and deemed an inactive chapter.

2. Since the fraternity and sorority leaders were elected presidents of their chapters, it was possible that these leaders participated previously in leadership experiences either through their chapter, on campus, or in the community.
3. Fraternity and sorority presidents usually partake in some form of leadership training either from their chapter, national organization, or campus activities office, which could possibly influence their style of leadership.

**Definition of Terms**

*Achieving Styles*

Lipman-Blumen, Handley-Isaksen and Leavitt (1983) define *achieving styles* as the “preferred strategies” or means people use to accomplish tasks, to achieve, to implement their plans, to get things done.

*Fraternity or Sorority Leader*

For the purposes of this study, a fraternity or sorority leader refers to any individual who has been elected to serve as president of a social Greek fraternity or sorority chapter, or Greek governing council at Ohio University. In order to be considered a social Greek fraternity or sorority at Ohio University, the chapter must be an active member organization of the Interfraternity Council (IFC), National Pan-Hellenic Council, Incorporated (NPHC); Women’s Panhellenic Association (WPA), or National Association of Latino Fraternal Organizations, Incorporated (NALFO).

*Follower*

Any individual who is a member of the social Greek fraternity or sorority chapter, or Greek governing council the fraternity or sorority leader presided over.

*Leadership*

In Chapter Two, the term *leadership* is further examined and encompasses several definitions. However, for the context of this research study, leadership was viewed as being a relational process in which people are engaged toward accomplishing a common
goal or task. This definition is based upon current leadership paradigms defined by noted research scholars (Komives, Lucas, & McMahan, 1998; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Lipman-Blumen, 1996). It is also important to note that this study viewed leadership as a process that involves multiple capacities and skills. Specifically, drawing from the work of Lipman-Blumen, leadership skills are learned behavioral strategies that are the source of leadership action.

*The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership®*

*The Leadership Challenge Model* by James Kouzes and Barry Posner reveal five practices that are common when leaders are able to make extraordinary things happen. These practices are known as The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership® and have five components—*Model the Way (Modeling)*, *Inspire a Shared Vision (Inspiring)*, *Challenge the Process (Challenging)*, *Enable Others to Act (Enabling)*, and *Encourage the Heart (Encouraging)*. The conceptual portion of The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership® framework was developed from the collection and analysis of case studies of personal-best leadership experiences (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

*Model the Way (Modeling).* Leaders have a philosophy of how group members and other constituents are to be treated. They believe that actions are more important than words or deeds and that consistency in their philosophy and actions is crucial to their success as leaders. Moreover, they view their interactions with others as an opportunity to teach what is right and what is wrong.

*Inspire a Shared Vision (Inspiring).* Leaders pioneer with a compass and a dream. They know that there is no freeway to the future and that the terrain is uncertain. To
compensate for this uncertainty, good leaders enlist help by communicating a positive image and working for the common good.

**Challenge the Process (Challenging).** Leaders see challenge as an opportunity for greatness and a chance to bring about change. They believe that maintaining the status quo promotes mediocrity and complacency; consequently, they constantly test their abilities and learn from their failures and disappointments.

**Enable Others to Act (Enabling).** Good leaders recognize and accept the fact that they can not do it all. Instead, they build teams with spirit and cohesion whose members feel good about each other. They develop an intimacy with the people with whom they work, and they realize that trust and respect can hold a group together.

**Encourage the Heart (Encouraging).** Leaders get extraordinary things done by working hard and constantly offering their membership encouragement, recognition, and rewards.

**Transactional Leadership**

Transactional leadership is the conception of an exchange (e.g., rewards, etc.) between the leader and the follower(s) which provides the means for successful leadership. Transactional leadership occurs when “leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another.... Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers” (Burns, 1978, p.4).

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership is the conception of putting the ends (in the form of a goal or vision) above the means. James MacGregor Burns (1978) defines transformational leadership as follows:
Transformational leadership occurs when, one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. But transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and the led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both. (p.20)
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

"Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on
earth" (Burns, 1978, p.2).

Introduction to the Literature

This literature review is inundated with studies that center on leadership.

“Leadership has been with us since the nomadic hunter-gatherers, when survival
depended on someone’s ability to lead successful hunting expeditions or guide their
wandering cluster of families from one dependable food source to another”
(Kippenberger, 2002, p.2). Hundreds of research studies have been conducted to identify
the personal attributes of leaders. Max Weber, Bernard Bass, and James MacGregor
Burns have given us most of the basic information we have on leadership behaviors,
styles, and characteristics (Scroggs, 1994, p.19). The original trait theories were based on
the belief that leaders possessed certain characteristics making them leaders. Basically,
trait theories compared the characteristics of a leader with the characteristics of a
follower. Situations in which leaders found themselves and characteristics of followers
were not part of the leadership equation. Also leader performance was not considered
important (Hollander & Offermann, 1990).

Critical Review of Relevant Literature

Theories of Leadership

Contemporary historical perspective of leadership.

The study of leadership can be roughly divided into three periods: the trait period,
from around 1910 to World War II, the behavior period, from the onset of World War II to the late 1960s, and the contingency period, from the late 1960s to the present (Chemers, Kellerman, 1984; Wren, 1995). Trait theories evolved around the notion that those who became leaders were different from those who remained followers. The objective of the research was to identify specifically what unique feature of the individual was associated with leadership. During this time, a large number of studies were done in which leaders and followers were compared on various measures to be related to leadership status or effectiveness. Leaders and followers were scored on measures such as dominance, social sensitivity, moodiness, masculinity, and others.

After the trait period, researchers began focusing on the study of leadership behavior. Classic studies such as Kurt Lewin’s leadership styles—autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire—emerged onto the scene, indicating that the democratic style of leadership had somewhat more beneficial results on group process than the other styles. The emphasis of behavioral studies shifted from the internal state of leaders to what leaders actually do. It was observed that leaders acted differently and used different leadership techniques as determined by the situations they were engaged in (Hollander & Offermann, 1990). As the notion of situational leadership evolved, various elements influencing leadership processes were studied. It was discovered that leader/follower relationships were not only affected by leader attributes but also by follower perceptions of those attributes. Therefore researchers used rating scales, interviews, and observations in an attempt to identify the specific behaviors in which leaders emerged.

Finally, contingency models and transactional approaches were developed. Contingency models looked at interactions of leader qualities and the situation. The main
idea of a contingency model is that effective leadership is contingent upon a number of factors and changes from situation to situation (Wren, 1995).

Fred Fiedler (1967) centered on a personality measure called the “esteem for the least-preferred co-worker” or LPC scale which he found to be related to group performance. In essence, this model dealt with the task and relationship orientation of the leader. He developed a scale of situational control based on three features of the situation. These were: 1) leader-member relations, 2) task structure, and 3) position power (Wren, 1995).

The Normative Decision Theory, a contingency model developed by Vroom and Yetton (1973), “attempts to deal with the complexities of the processes involved in leadership by specifying: (1) a set of alternatives among which a choice is to be made, (2) the general nature of the processes which they affect, (3) the principal variables governing the effects of the alternatives on each process, and (4) explicit rules for decision-making based on estimates of the outcome of each process” (Vroom & Yetton, 1973, p. 56). They used two basic questions to examine leader behavior: “How should leaders behave if they are to be effective?” and “How do they behave?” (Vroom & Yetton, 1973, p. 197). They selected the “leader’s role in the decision-making process, specifically the degree to which he encouraged the participation of his subordinates in solving problems or making decisions” (Vroom & Yetton, 1973, p. 197) as one of the leader behaviors they felt to be of major importance and worthy of study.

Another well-known contingency theory of leadership is the Path Goal Theory (House, 1971). This model is based on “the leader’s effectiveness in increasing subordinates’ motivation along a path leading to a goal” (Hollander & Offermann, 1990,
It assumes that leaders are flexible and that they can change their style, as situations require. The theory proposes two contingency variables, such as environment and follower characteristics, that moderate the leader behavior – outcome relationship.

Transactional approaches to leadership emphasize the transaction between the leader and the follower which provides the means for successful leadership (Wren, 1995). It supports the idea that leader and follower, are involved in a social exchange. Leaders give benefits to followers, and followers give leaders higher regard and are responsive to their leadership. Importance is placed on followers’ perceptions of the leader (Hollander & Offermann, 1990).

Charismatic leadership is rooted in the leader’s emotional appeal to followers. It is suggested that followers have a deep faith in the leader’s beliefs and/or vision and adapt their own beliefs accordingly (Wren, 1995). The followers essentially develop an emotional attachment to the leader’s goals and mission and seek to contribute to the successes any way they can (Hollander & Offerman, 1990).

In 1978, James MacGregor Burns focused on the concept of transformational leadership. This form of leadership is more about hearts and minds and empowering people rather than using rewards to control them. It helps people to learn and to seek change and improvement. Transformational leadership substitutes vision for objective and relies on motivation that comes from a shared goal, not just a rewarded one (Burns, 1978).

Finally, the Connective Leadership Model by Jean Lipman-Blumen, allows leaders to draw upon a broad spectrum of behaviors and a set of political or “instrumental styles” that use the self and others as instruments for accomplishing goals (1996). It
strives to emphasize the connection of individuals to their own, as well as others', tasks and ego drives.

*Historical perspective of leadership in higher education.*

From the very beginning, leadership and higher education in the United States have been harmoniously connected. On October 28, 1636, the first American college (Harvard) was founded. Like most other early colleges, its primary role was to educate clergy. In addition to an educated clergy, Massachusetts needed leaders, disciplined by knowledge and learning, it needed followers disciplined by leaders, it need order (Brubacher & Willis, 1997).

By 1840, Greek-letter fraternities existed on many college campuses. Although Phi Beta Kappa, founded in 1776, is commonly referred to as the first national Greek-letter fraternity, it was essentially a literary society. The real creation of social fraternities came with the founding of the so-called Union Triad- Kappa Alpha in 1825; Sigma Phi, in 1827; and Delta Phi, also in 1827 (Brubacher & Willis, 1997). Because social fraternities were considered more demanding and created a higher level of loyalty and secrecy, literary societies declined in number and strength. Literary societies challenged academic issues and intellectual theories, but fraternities addressed social issues such as brotherhood, friendship, and fellowship. During this time, organized athletics also came in to the forefront. The simultaneous rise of literary societies, Greek-letter fraternities, and athletic competition created an immediate need for student leaders and secured the future of leadership development in higher education.
**Transactional Leadership**

Burns (1978) states that transactional leadership “occurs when a person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things” (p. 19). This exchange of valued things can range from money to votes to electronic goods. During this exchange, each person is consciously aware of the power resources and attitudes of the other person (Burns, 1978). Beyond this exchange, there is no permanent purpose or durable bond that holds them together; thus they may go their separate way.

Many leadership studies refer to leadership as transactional in nature and describe it as a “bargain struck by both parties to the exchange” (House & Singh, 1987; Scroggs, 1994). Transactional theory says when the environment fails to provide motivation, satisfaction or direction for followers, the leader through his or her behavior will be effective in compensating for this (House, Woycke, & Fodor, 1988). Transactional leaders identify what is missing for followers and work to fill the gap. Transactional leadership focuses on followers’ perceptions of and expectations about the leader’s actions and motives as they relate to his or her personal attributes (Hollander & Offermann, 1990).

Factors involved in transactional leadership are contingent reward and management by exception. Contingent reward places leaders in the position to tell followers what to do to achieve desired rewards for their efforts. In management by exception leaders avoid giving directions if old ways are working. Leaders intervene only if standards are not met (Avolio & Bass, 1987). Using contingent rewards in a leadership situation means leaders and followers are entrenched in bargaining. They maintain their
relationship as long as their needs can be met through reciprocal exchange of rewards for services provided (Howell, 1988). Therefore, effectiveness of transactional leaders is dependent upon their understanding of follower needs and their definition of rewards. Leaders must be able to “recognize and clarify roles and tasks required of the followers reaching the desired outcomes” (Bass, 1985, p.12).

Transactional leadership is based on contingent reinforcement and is a form of leadership that “offer[s] either the promise of reward or the threat of discipline, depending upon followers’ performance of specific and measurable tasks” (McLean & Weitzel, 1992, p.54). It is transaction in the form of reciprocity, the idea that the relationship between the leader and follower develops from the exchange of a reward in return for work well done (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transactional leaders recognize needs of followers and try to meet those needs. For this type of leader meeting needs and rewarding goal accomplishment is the means of motivating followers (Avolio & Bass, 1987). Transactional leaders give followers something they want in exchange for something the leader wants. They are in fact mutually dependent on one another. Both the leader’s and followers’ accomplishments are rewarded (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1989). It is an exchange process where each, leader and follower get something they want (Cronin, 1989).

The transactional style of leadership accomplishes goals by making “explicit the roles and expectations required to achieve the goals” (Getzels & Guba, 1987, p.439). Because people are involved, their personalities and dispositions must be taken into account. In this model the part role and personality play in determining behavior varies
with particular behaviors. Sometimes, role is more the determining factor, and sometimes, personality is more dominant.

The role of the leader in this process is comparable to that of all leaders. He or she is to provide motivation, direction and a satisfying task for followers. Transactional leaders assist followers by: (a) clarifying what is expected of them, (b) explaining how to meet expectations, (c) spelling out criteria for evaluation of effective performance, (d) providing feedback to the follower, and (e) allocating rewards contingent on performance (Bass, 1990, p.339).

Many researchers (Bass, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989) agree that transactional leaders manage and maintain while transformational leaders promote fundamental change in organizations. In essence, transactional leaders tend to maintain the status quo. They get the job done but do not motivate others to see beyond the short term or do more than is required. They reward followers for performance. Traditional managers would be described as transactional leaders (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is considered an adaptive model. It is leadership that focuses on a committing style (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). By using this style of leadership, leaders engage followers so they mutually raise one another’s expectations and motivation levels (Burns, 1978). It involves shifts in followers’ beliefs, values, needs, and capabilities (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Transformational leadership is based upon a foundation “that inspire and/or stimulate followers to join together in a mutually satisfying achievement of genuine consequence” (McLean & Weitzel, 1992, p.54). Burns
defines transformational leadership as more than getting people to do a task. In MacGregor Burns’ words, “transformational leadership refers to the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization’s mission, objectives, and strategies” (p. 378).

A transactional leader provides rewards and punishments based on subordinate output (contingent reward) and may only intervene when he observes deviation from standard procedure (management-by-exception), but transformational leaders move their employees beyond the basic economic exchange process (Bass & Avolio, 1983). Transformational leaders offer a purpose that transcends short-term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. Transformational leaders appeal to the individual’s needs and not simply the job’s task. In more specific terms, a leader is described as transformational if he or she exhibits any combination of the following behaviors: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass, 1990; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Judge & Bono, 2000). They behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of the “Four I’s” (Avolio, B., Waldman, D., & Yammarino, F., 1991; Bass & Avolio, 1994):

1. Idealized influence: the degree to which the leader behaves in admirable ways that cause followers to identify with the leader. Charismatic leaders display convictions, take stands and appeal to followers on an emotional level. This is about the leader having a clear set of values and demonstrating them in every action, providing a role model for their followers.
2. Inspirational motivation: the degree to which the leader articulates a vision that is appealing and inspiring to followers. Leaders with inspirational motivation challenge followers with high standards, communicate optimism about future goal attainment and provide meaning for the task at hand. Followers need to have a strong sense of purpose if they are to be motivated to act. Purpose and meaning provide the energy that drives a group forward. It is also important that this visionary aspect of leadership is supported by the communication skills that allow the leader to articulate their vision with precision and power, in a compelling and persuasive way.

3. Intellectual stimulation: the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, takes risks and solicits followers' ideas. Leaders with this trait stimulate and encourage creativity in their followers.

4. Individualized consideration: the degree to which the leader attends to each follower's needs, acts as a mentor or coach to the follower and listens to the follower's concerns and needs. This also encompasses the need to respect and celebrate the individual contribution that each follower can make to the team (it is the diversity of the team that gives it its true strength).

“Transformational leadership is expected to contribute to an organization’s efforts to improve its operations and the best use of its human resources” (Hickman, 1998, p.138). Karl Kuhnert (1994) focuses on transformational leadership with regards to the connection of the delegation process with the moral development of the leader. Delegation is included as part of the overall developmental strategy for elevating the needs and potential of both leader and follower in the organization (Kuhnert, 1994). Bass
and Avolio have found transformational leadership to varying degrees at every level in the organization from the informal leadership that takes place in team activities to the leadership displayed by chief executive officers (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Francis Yammarino (1994) describes how transformational leadership may cascade downward in the organization through many levels as well as bypass levels. Consequently, the leader can exert influence indirectly at an organizational distance by the behaviors and actions that serve as role models and by the culture that is developed to support the leader’s vision and mission (Yammarino, 1994).

Bernard Bass (1983) considers the linkages between transformational leadership and decision making in teams and organizations. By combining his model of organizational decision making with Bass and Avolio’s model of transformational leadership, a framework that features the impact of transformational leadership on the information-processing strategies of leaders, teams, and followers in the organization. It also shows how leaders, teams, and followers make effective decisions (Bass, 1983).

Transformational leaders connect with followers or members and motivate them to work for intangible goals instead of immediate self interests. Follower rewards are internal rather than external. Followers work for higher order rewards such as achievement and self actualization instead of safety and security (Avolio & Bass, 1987; Bass, 1990; Burns, 1978; Howell, 1988).

This type of leader also motivates followers to do more than they ever expected they could do. This is accomplished by raising the followers’ levels of awareness and consciousness about the importance and value of reaching designated outcomes (Scroggs, 1994). These leaders encourage their followers to look beyond self interest for the sake of
organization. They also alter subordinate need levels on Maslow’s hierarchy and expand their needs and wants (Murray & Feitler, 1989).

The transformational leader connects with and transforms followers or subordinates on the basis of shared motives, values and goals. Their purposes become one. Aspiration levels for both leader and follower are raised and this in turn increases their level of performance (Burns, 1978).

House, Woycke, and Fodor (1988) found transformational leadership theories predicted performance beyond expectations. They found followers became emotionally attached to leaders. Transactional leaders affected ways followers thought about their task and their ability to accomplish it. Transformational leaders affected followers’ emotions and self esteem.

Tichy and Devanna (1986) identified several characteristics of transformational leaders. These leaders see themselves as change agents. They are courageous, but also prudent risk takers. They are not afraid to take stands. They believe in people and work toward empowerment of others. They are value driven and behave in ways congruent with their values. They are life long learners, and view mistakes as learning experiences rather than as failures. They have the ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity and uncertainty. They are visionaries and are able to dream and translate those dreams into images others can share and understand (pp. 30-32).

Transformational leaders are perceived as effective by their subordinates and superiors (Bass, 1990; House et al., 1988). They are viewed as having a more effective communication style and as contributing more to an organization’s overall effectiveness than are transactional leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1987). They are judged by their superiors
to have more potential than transactional leaders and they are seen as having the ability to be good managers. They can handle day to day details as well as promote a vision (Avolio & Bass, 1987; Bass, 1990).

Bernard Bass (1990) found transformational leadership is what people describe or picture when they are asked to define their ideal leader. Transformational leaders are more likely to be role models with whom followers want to identify (p. 54).

Charismatic Leadership

The word “charisma” comes from the Greek word for “gift of grace” and has, through the ages, been used by the Christian church to signify a divinely bestowed power or talent (Kippenberger, 2002). Max Weber (1947) identified charisma as one form of leadership authority- the authority bestowed on the leader by his or her followers. Charisma has been studied as a trait (Weber, 1947) and as a set of behaviors (House, 1977; House & Baetz, 1979; House & Howell, 1992). The trait approach to charisma looks at qualities such as being visionary, energetic, unconventional, and exemplary (Bass, 1985; Conger, 1989; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; House, 1977). Sociologists, political historians, and political scientists have widely accepted the theory of charismatic leadership originally advanced by Weber (1947). Since then, several scholars have advanced additional theories that invoke the concept of charismatic leadership (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; Trice & Beyer, 1986).

In the mid-1970s, Robert House began revisiting Weber’s concept of charismatic leadership. Charismatic leaders can be best recognized by the reactions of their followers. Charisma is often attributed to leaders by their followers and is based on the perceptions of followers and the attributions of the leader, the context of the situation, and the needs
of individuals and the group (Komives et. al, 1998). For example, followers have deep faith in the leader’s beliefs and/or vision and adapt their own beliefs accordingly (Kippenberger, 2002). In essence, followers develop an emotional attachment to the leader’s goals and mission and seek to contribute to their successful achievement in any way they can.

According to the most formulation of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985), charismatic leadership is apart of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) identifies three characteristics of transformational leaders. These leaders have charismatic or inspirational personality traits, demonstrate individualized consideration for those they lead and possess ability to provide intellectual stimulation to followers. Charismatic leaders have (a) an extraordinary power or vision and are able to communicate it to others, or (b) unusual powers of practical leadership that will enable him or her to achieve the goals that will alleviate followers’ distress (Johnson & Johnson, 1994).

A charismatic leader is one who has “profound and unusual effects on followers” (Yukl, 1994, p.318). Charismatic leaders are often described as visionaries who have a strong desire for power; leaders have been called impression managers who have a keen ability to motivate others and set an example for others to follow (Komives, et. al, 1998; Yukl, 1994). Charismatic leaders use charisma to infuse pride, faith and respect in followers. The leader distinguishes what is really important, has a sense of mission and effectively communicates it to followers. The relationship between leader and follower is based on the follower’s belief in the leader (Scoggs, 1994). Charismatic leaders present a vision and followers accept the vision believing the leader has qualities needed to accomplish the task (Howell, 1988).
Charismatic leadership is defined by effects it has on followers. “The charismatic leader will appeal to followers based on the image of a better future embodied in the leader as a role model with appeal to followers being based on the image of a better future as articulated in the leader’s action” (Avilo & Yammarino, 2002, p. 117; House & Podsakoff, 1994; Hunt, Boal & Dodge, 1999). A list of charismatic behaviors include: role modeling, image building, goal articulation, exhibition of high expectations, influence on follower’s goals, and arousal of follower’s motive (House, 1977; Scroggs, 1994).

Leaders possessing charisma “act accordingly to a certain ‘vision’ that specifies a better future state” and “strive toward distal, rather than proximate, goals” (Mumford & Strange, 2002, p.122). They create and maintain a positive image in the minds of followers and show a high degree of self confidence and confidence in their beliefs (Sroggs, 1994). They behave in a manner that reinforces the vision. They communicate high expectations to followers and confidence in their ability to meet them (Howell, 1988).

According to House (1977), leaders who communicate high performance expectations for followers and exhibit confidence in their ability to meet such expectations are hypothesized to enhance followers’ self-esteem and to affect the goals they accept or set for themselves. “A charismatic leader is able to receive trust from followers or be accepted by followers through empowerment” (Kim, Dansereau, & Kim, 2002, p. 149; Avolio & Strange, 2002). Empowerment refers to “a process whereby an individual’s belief in his or her self-efficacy is enhanced” (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 474). Likewise, Kouzes and Posner (1995) argue that followers feel empowered when a
leader ensures self-leadership, believes in followers’ abilities, develops their competence, assigns critical tasks, offers visible support, etc. A leader’s empowering behavior influences whether he or she is accepted as a charismatic leader.

Charismatic leaders utilize power in two ways. They either have a socialized approach or a personalized approach. Socialized power enables followers. In this case, the leader values power for the “good” that can be done with it. Goals of the group or organization are based on needs of followers. The leader involves followers in a constructive manner to complete a task. On the flip side, by using personalized power, the leader seeks obedience and uses work groups or followers to accomplish his or her personal goals. This type of leader uses dominant, authoritarian behaviors (Howell, 1988).

Gender and Leadership

Because maleness has been equated with effective leadership in our society, transformational leadership characteristics have been labeled feminine rather than masculine (Hughes, 1989). Transformational leaders are compassionate, willing to share power, flexible, unafraid of emotion, and conscious of their own and others’ strengths and weaknesses. These traits traditionally have been considered feminine.

In the “International Women’s Forum Survey of Men and Women Leaders” conducted by Judy B. Rosener (1990), a number of similarities between men and women leaders were found, along with some important differences. According to the survey, men and women in similar managerial jobs make the same amount of money and experience roughly the same degree of work—family conflict. In addition, most men and women describe themselves as having an equal mix of traits that are considered feminine (i.e.
understanding, compassionate, and sensitive) *masculine* (i.e. dominant, assertive, and competitive), and *gender-neutral* (adaptive, sincere, and reliable).

But the similarities end when men and women describe their leadership style, performance, and how they usually influence those with whom they work. Men are much more likely than women to view leadership as a series of transactions with subordinates, and to use their position and control of resources to motivate their followers. Women, on the other hand, are far more likely than men to describe themselves as transforming subordinates' self-interest into concern for the whole organization and as using personal traits like charisma, work record, and interpersonal skills to motivate others.

Rosener suggests that women leaders practice "interactive leadership"— trying to make every interaction with coworkers positive for all involved by encouraging participation, sharing power and information, making people feel important, and energizing them. In general, women have been expected to be supportive and cooperative, and they have not held long series of positions with formal authority. This may explain why women leaders today tend to be more interactive than men. But interactive leadership should not be linked directly to being female, since some men use that style and some women prefer the command— and —control style. Organizations that are open to leadership styles that play to individuals' strengths will increase their chances of surviving in a fast— changing environment.

In a study of gender and leadership it was found that women do lead differently than men. They were more oriented toward interpersonal relationships, whereas men concentrated on tasks. Women were more democratic or participative and were slightly more concerned with morale and social relationships (Eagly, 1991). This study also
proposed that people expect different behaviors based on their beliefs about how men and women should lead or manage an organization. People’s expectations about these behaviors “match their expectations about men much more closely than their expectations about women” (Eagly, 1991, p. 6). Workers expect leaders to be assertive, decisive and dominant; characteristics stereotypically associated with males.

Women tend to lead by cooperation and collaboration. They use control less than men. They solve problems using intuition and empathy in addition to rationality. They encourage participation, sharing power and information and enhancement of worker self-worth (Eagly, 1991, p.4). Feminine principles of leadership include “caring, making intuitive decisions, not getting hung up on hierarchy” (Helgesen, 1990, p. 39). Women emphasize negotiation and collaboration rather than power and control.

Achieving Styles

In 1972, Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt engaged in research regarding the differences between women and men in the behaviors they used to achieve their goals. This research propelled further investigation on achieving styles, and in turn, helped lay the foundation for The Achieving Styles Model and Connective Leadership. Lipman-Blumen, Handley-Isaksen and Leavitt (1983) define achieving styles as the “preferred strategies” or means people use to accomplish tasks, to achieve, to implement their plans, to get things done. The term achieving styles, rather than achievement styles was deliberately selected by Lipman-Blumen to convey “a sense of the action used in the pursuit of goals” (p.55, 2000). Their theory birthed The Achieving Styles Model, which divides achieving styles into three sets— Direct, Relational, and Instrumental, and each
style includes three individual styles, which collectively compose a full arrangement of nine distinct achieving styles.

Direct. “People who prefer the direct set of behavioral styles tend to confront their own tasks individually and directly (hence the "direct" label), emphasizing mastery, competition, and power” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p.24). The individual may complete the task him or herself or delegate it to another person. The leader, however, does remain in control of the other person in the process (Lipman-Blumen et al., 1983). The direct achieving style has three categories. They are defined as:

- **Intrinsic**— a preference to handle tasks individually.
- **Competitive**— a preference to compare one’s own accomplishments to others’. Doing better than others is what counts the most.
- **Power**— a preference for use of power to accomplish tasks. The leader takes charge and actively and overtly controls situations. (Lipman-Blumen, 1996).

Relational. “People who prefer to work on group tasks or help others to attain their goals emphasize the *relational* set” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p.25). Collaboration, nurturing, taking pride in and contributing to other’s accomplishments are ways leaders motivate followers. This type of behavior is often associated with traditional female behavior (Lipman-Blumen, 1989). The relational achieving style has three categories. They are defined as:

- **Collaborative**— a preference to accomplish tasks within the milieu of a group. This style believes that the best efforts are stimulated by the group’s interaction.
• **Contributory**— contributing to the success of others. He/she allows others to define goals and the means for accomplishing them.

• **Vicarious**— when the leader identifies with achievers and perceive others’ accomplishments as his/her own. The leader that obtains this style guides and encourages others to their goals, but does not participate in the performance of tasks (Lipman-Blumen, 1996).

**Instrumental.** “Individuals who use themselves and others as instruments toward community goals” are said to prefer the instrumental set of style (p.25, Lipman-Blumen, 1996). “The political savvy embedded in the instrumental styles helps to diminish the sparks created by the friction between direct and relational behavior” (http://www.achievingstyles.com, 2006). The instrumental achieving style has three categories. They are defined as:

  • **Entrusting**— believing the world is simply filled with people ready and willing to help them achieve their tasks.

  • **Personal**— the use of charisma, intellect, wit, physical attractiveness, and past/or present achievements or attributes to attain a position for new success or to convince others to help in the task.

  • **Social**— the utilization of relationships with others as a way to achieve (Lipman-Blumen, 1996).

**Connective Leadership**

A new era has emerged that is marked by two contradictory forces, interdependence and diversity, pulling in opposite directions (Lipman-Blumen, 200, p.3). These tensions generated by interdependence and diversity are the hallmark of this new
age Lipman-Blumen (2000) calls the "Connective Era" (p.3). To succeed in this vastly altered environment calls for a more complex, but nevertheless attainable, leadership repertoire. This leadership repertoire is what she calls Connective Leadership (p.3). Such a leadership model offers the possibility of distilling the most constructive elements of both diversity and interdependence.

Jean Lipman-Blumen (1989) had extended the notion of transformational leadership and its relationship to achievement styles. She describes Connective Leadership as “...[a] more politically savvy and instrumental, yet more ethical, authentic, accountable, and particularly, [a] more ennobling” approach to leadership (Lipman-Blumen, 2000, p. xi). This type of leadership integrates various achieving styles (direct, instrumental, and relational) in such a way to enable people and systems to come together for mutual benefit.

Connective leadership utilizes all three of the achieving styles. This leadership approach believes that connective leaders connect individuals to task and group. Leaders try to help followers feel connected “to the task, to others, to human interaction, to group process and to the system” (Lipman-Blumen, 1989, p. 31). It relies on valuing and empowering followers (Komives, 1991). Leaders use mutual goals not external enemies to create group cohesion. This is similar to transformational leadership because it emphasizes goals rather than rewards. This kind of leader motivates followers by “collaboration and connections to and through others, networks based on relationships, and revitalized individualism...” (Lipman-Blumen, 1989, p.33).

Connective leaders “raise charismatic leadership to new levels” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p.231). They also understand the limits of consensual decision making and are able
to communicate a vision and engage followers in the vision in such a way it becomes their own. The leader also becomes linked to the followers’ dreams (Lipman-Blumen, 1996). By empowering followers, connective leaders turn followers into leaders. This is how achieving style preferences cause leaders to be connective or transformational as opposed to transactional.

Lipman-Blumen’s approach to leadership is endorsed by Naisbitt and Aburdene (1990). Values that surfaced from their discussion were “vision, commitment, shared power and responsibility” (p. 218). Therefore, connective leaders are not interested in hierarchy, but instead are concerned with empowering followers by sharing power. Those leaders of the nineties [and beyond, will] serve as coach, teacher and facilitator rather than order giver (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990).

**Student Leadership Characteristics and Achieving Styles**

Literature regarding students and their leadership characteristics and achievement style preferences is very limited. Little is known about how students lead and how they prefer to achieve their goals. Student Affairs professionals and administrators think they instinctively know the achievement motivations of particular students. However, it is unclear if those students who are elected or appointed to leadership positions on college campuses prefer similar types of achievement styles as they lead their organizations.

Striffolino and Saunders (1989) outlined student leaders’ personal characteristics. They indicated high performing student groups are led by people who care deeply about the organization and its success. The leader values the organization and integrates personal ambitions with organizational needs.
Posner and Brodsky (1992) studied 100 fraternity presidents and categorized their leadership behaviors as follows: challenging, inspiring, enabling, modeling, and encouraging. The purpose in conducting this study was to develop the student version of Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and “enable college students to measure their own leadership capability” (Posner & Brodsky, 1992, p. 231). The LPI describes leadership behaviors using the following categories: (a) *Model the way*, (b) *Inspire a shared vision*, (c) *Challenge the process*, (d) *Enable others to act*, and (e) *Encourage the heart* (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Komives (1991) found women leaders thought they were least skilled in challenging the process. Their scores were similar in “value and last ranked position” of those of male fraternity presidents in Posner and Brodsky’s study (Komives, 1991, p.4). Women leaders whom followers felt were transformational or empowering practiced collaborative relational achieving styles. Komives (1991) found “men who practice contributory relational achieving styles were seen as empowering” (p.5). This may mean men empower others by distributing power or delegating responsibility while women empower through collaboration and being a part of accomplishing goals. Women share power (Komives, 1991).

**Summary Conclusions**

While literature is plentiful about leadership practices and organizational effectiveness in the business and industry sector and in general, there is little information about how students lead, how followers perceive their leadership, or how student leaders use their leadership and achieving styles to carry out goals.
Student Affairs professionals have had to rely on business and industry to provide them with studies on leadership and leadership performance. These studies often discuss management, which is different than leadership. Management in the sixties and the seventies relied on transactional leadership methods, whereas management in the eighties and nineties involved followers and was more collaborative in nature. James MacGregor Burns (1978), Bernard Bass (1989) and others would describe this method as transformational.

Leaders are “expected to take [followers] on journeys to places [they] have never been before” (Johnson & Johnson, 1994, p. 198). Leaders are expected to challenge the status quo and to take followers on a journey to enhance their skills and to create an innovative and improved organization. Leadership helps to breathe a new way of life throughout an organization. It is collectively connected with the process of innovation, of bringing new ideas, methods, or solutions into use. Leaders are agents of change, and change requires leadership (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). A leader highlights the challenges the organization faces and makes them shared challenges for the followers. Leaders create a sense of “family” within the organization, where each member cares about each other and understands the vision the leader is trying to accomplish.

Transactional leaders influence, inspire, and stimulate members. They provide a clear mission that all members are committed to achieving and set goals that guides members’ efforts (Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Johnson & Johnson, 1989; Johnson & Johnson, 1994)). They empower members through cooperative teamwork and lead by example in order to reach the set goals.
Student Affairs professionals, along with student organization advisors plan and implement various leadership development programs to help students run their organizations more effectively. Usually this takes shape in the form of workshops that educate leaders on effective communication skills, parliamentary procedure, resources available to them on and off campus, and guidelines and policies affecting student organizations.

When student leadership programs are developed, the student’s and organizational needs are taken into consideration, but leadership style inventories or assessments are rarely used. This is because few inventories or assessments have been designed specifically for student use.

This study examined a particular group of student leaders and discussed how they lead based on Kouzes and Posner’s student version of the Leadership Preference Inventory. The relationship of their leadership and achieving style was also studied. Hopefully, the results and findings will give Student Affairs professionals and those advising student organizations, particularly fraternity and sorority chapters and councils, information and advice on how to assist them in their work with emerging leaders as well as those currently serving as leaders of organizations.
CHAPTER THREE  

Method  

Research Design  

The researcher used a cross-sectional non-experimental design in this study, which was both descriptive and comparative. Specifically, five questions guided the design of this study: (a) What are fraternity and sorority leaders’ self-described leadership behaviors and achieving styles? (b) Are there significant differences between how these leaders describe their leadership styles and their followers’ descriptions of these styles? (c) What is the relationship between fraternity and sorority leaders’ self-reported achieving styles and their self-assessed leadership behaviors? (d) What is the relationship between the followers’ assessment of fraternity and sorority leaders’ behaviors and those leaders’ achieving styles? and (e) Do fraternity and sorority leaders have different achieving styles according to gender?  

Operational Definition of the Variables  

The operational variables in this study included: achieving styles, and self-described leadership behaviors. Achieving styles are separated into three sets- Direct, Relational, and Instrumental and were operationally measured by administering the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI) (See Appendix H). The ASI is used to measure respondents’ preference to use a particular task or set of behaviors (achieving styles) to achieve their objectives (Lipman-Blumen, 2000). The ASI instrument contains 45 items and the respondent may choose from a 7 point scale, ranging from 1=never, to 7=always.  

Self-described leadership behaviors represented The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership® by James Kouzes and Barry Posner and was operationally measured by
administering the *Student Leadership Practices Inventory*. Five practices common to all leaders included: Model the way (Modeling), Inspire a shared vision (Inspiring), Challenge the process (Challenging), Enable others to act (Enabling), and Encourage the Heart (Encouraging). The *Student LPI* (see Appendices E and F) questionnaire contains 30 statements and the participant may choose from a five point Likert scale from 1= rarely or seldom, to 5= very frequently or almost always.

Identification of the Population

The population for this study consisted of fraternity and sorority leaders at Ohio University, a public, four-year higher education institution. The sample was comprised of presidents of fraternity and sorority chapters or governing councils, who were in office during the fall quarter of 2006.

Demographic data on each student was collected to determine age and academic student standing. An assumption was made that the student leaders and followers are of traditional college age (i.e. between the ages of 18 and 22). Size of organizations led by these students ranged from 1 to 96 member(s) for fraternity presidents and 1 to 132 member(s) for sorority presidents. There were 31 chapters, and the average fraternity or sorority chapter size was 44 for the fraternities and 80 for the sororities. There were 17 males who served as fraternity presidents and led all male organizations. There was 1 female who served as a fraternity president and led a co-ed organization. There were 13 females who served as sorority presidents and led all female organizations. There were 3 governing councils- the Interfraternity Council, OU-National Pan-Hellenic Council, Incorporated; and Women’s Panhellenic Association. One male served as the president of an all male governing council, 1 female served as the president of an all female governing
council, and 1 female served as the president of a co-ed, fraternity/sorority governing council. There were 19 fraternity presidents, 14 sorority presidents, and 1 co-ed, fraternity/sorority president. Additionally, there was demographic data collected on the randomly selected followers or members of chapters or governing councils. Potentially, there were 76 male followers and 60 female followers.

**Sampling Plan**

For the purpose of this study, a particular nonrandom sample was chosen in order to identify the fraternity and sorority presidents. The nonrandom method that was used is termed purposive sampling.

Purposive samples are not probability samples, but they can be useful in predicting future behavior or attitudes of the target population (Hagan, 1989). The selection of such a sample is based on the researcher’s skill, judgment and needs. By using a purposive sample, the researcher is intentionally trying to obtain a representative sample by selecting 1) unique cases that are especially informative or 2) members of a difficult-to-reach specialized population (Neuman, 1997).

The question remained if there was an adequate relationship between the sample and the population. When a purposive sample is used it is important that the study be replicated using different populations (Kerlinger, 1986). Because this study was exploratory, it should be replicated before it is generalized to other populations.

Additionally, four members from each president’s chapter or council were asked to complete the *Student LPI-Observer* on behalf of the president. A simple random sampling method was used to select the members from each president’s chapter or council because 1) the researcher was interested in how followers perceive the leaders in
these particular organizations that select their own members rather than open their membership to anyone who wishes to join, and 2) this prevented the president from intentionally selecting members who would give biased answers.

Instrumentation

Selection/development of instruments.

Two instruments were used in this study to determine fraternity and sorority leaders’ leadership behaviors and achieving styles. Each fraternity and sorority leader was asked to respond to statements on the Student Leadership Practices Inventory developed by Posner and Kouzes (2003) and the online version of the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory (2003), originally designed by Jean Lipman-Blumen, Alice Handley-Isaksen, and Harold J. Leavitt in 1979.

Leadership Practices Inventory.

The Leadership Practices Inventory was originally developed by Kouzes and Posner in 1987 for use with managers. They found by using the Personal Best Survey (Kouzes & Posner, 1987), and in interviews with managers at various levels, a pattern of behavior occurred. They described this behavior as The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership®, each having two commitments:

1. Challenging the process
   a) Searching for opportunities.
   b) Experimenting and taking risks.

2. Inspiring a shared vision
   a) Envisioning the future.
   b) Enlisting others to act.
3. **Enabling others to act**
   
a) Fostering collaboration.

b) Strengthening others.

4. **Modeling the way**

a) Setting the example.

b) Planning small wins.

5. **Encouraging the Heart**

a) Recognizing contributions.


During the development stages, enabling others to act was the leadership practice that respondents reported using the most. This was followed by challenging the process, modeling the way and encouraging the heart.

To refine the statements, over 3000 managers and their subordinates were involved in using the instrument. The current instrument contains 30 statements- six statements to measure each of The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership®. There are two forms of the instrument, the LPI-Self and the LPI-Other (Kouzes & Posner, 2003).

The Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) by Kouzes and Posner (2003) was developed because “valid instruments designed specifically for college students to measure their leadership development did not exist” (p.6). The development of a student version of the instrument followed the same case-study approach as the original Leadership Practices Inventory to investigate whether the leadership behaviors of college students were comparable with those of managers. Students differ from the managerial population by age, experience and type of organization they lead. College
students lead groups of volunteers who are from their peer group. Leadership and membership in such student groups often have high turn over rates (Posner & Brodsky, 1992).

There are two forms of the current (2nd ed., 2006) instrument, the Student LPI-Self (Appendix E) and Student LPI-Observer (Appendix F). The forms differ only in the individuals who complete them. The Student LPI-Self form is completed by the student leader himself or herself, and the Student LPI-Observer form is completed by a person who has directly observed the leadership behaviors of that student leader. Each form consists of 30 statements-six statements to measure each of The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership®:

1. **Model the way**
   
   a) Finding your voice.
   
   b) Setting the example.

2. **Inspiring a shared vision**
   
   a) Envision the future.
   
   b) Enlist others.

3. **Challenge the process**
   
   a) Search for opportunities.
   
   b) Experiment and take risks.

4. **Enable others to act**
   
   a) Foster collaboration.
   
   b) Strengthen others.

5. **Encourage the heart**
a) Recognize contributions.

b) Celebrate the values and victories. (Kouzes & Posner, 2003, p.22)

The *Student LPI* assesses the frequency of use of *The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership®*, and leadership behaviors. The respondent may choose from a five-point scale. A higher value indicates greater use of the leadership behavior: (a) rarely or seldom do/does what is described, (b) once in a while do/does what is described, (c) sometimes do/does what is described, (d) often do/does what is described, and (e) very frequently or almost always do/does what is described.

*L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory.*

The *L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory* (ASI) (Appendix H) is a 45 item Likert scale instrument, ranging from never (1) to always (7), that is used to measure respondents’ preference to use a particular task or set of behaviors (achieving styles) to achieve their objectives (Lipman-Blumen, 2000).

The ASI conceptualizes achieving styles into three styles and each style consists of three sub-styles (Lipman-Blumen et al., 1983). They are:

1. Direct
   a) Intrinsic
   b) Competitive
   c) Power
2. Relational
   a) Collaborative
   b) Contributory
   c) Vicarious
3. Instrumental
   a) Personal
   b) Social
   c) Entrusting (Lipman-Blumen, 2000).

The ASI has five assessment questions for each sub-style. Questions either describe behaviors used to approach tasks or accomplish goals, or describe feelings about specific approaches for accomplishing tasks. In terms of scoring, each participant’s scores across the five items in each scale is summed and divided by the number of items answered (Lipman-Blumen, 2002). The scores on the three styles within the set are averaged for a set score (Lipman-Blumen, 2002).

Reliability and Validity Issues

Reliability of Leadership Practices Inventory and Student Leadership Practices Inventory.

Internal reliability for the LPI and Student LPI is quite strong. Internal reliability refers to the extent to which items in a scale are associated with one another (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). “The Student Leadership Practices Inventory has been field-tested and proven reliable in identifying the behaviors that make a difference in student leaders’ effectiveness” (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p. 8). All five leadership practices have internal reliability scores that are above .75 for the Self version, and all scores on the Observer version are consistently above the .85 level (Table 3.1). Test-retest reliability scores are very high and routinely in the .90-plus range. Tests showed no significant social desirability bias. In general, the scores on the LPI have been relatively stable over time.
because every two years since 1987, they have compared \textit{LPI} scores from the participants of The Leadership Challenge Workshop ™.

Table 3.1

\textit{Reliability (Cronbach Alpha) Coefficients for the LPI}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Self Observer (All)</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Direct Co-Worker Report or Peer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textit{Validity of Leadership Practices Inventory and Student Leadership Practices Inventory.}

As Kouzes and Posner developed the \textit{Leadership Practices Inventory} (LPI) and the \textit{Student Leadership Practices Inventory} (Student LPI), they conducted a number of tests to determine how accurately it predicts performance. They looked at how the \textit{LPI} and \textit{Student LPI} scores are correlated with other measures, typically of important
outcomes such as satisfaction, productivity, team spirit, pride, reputation, and the like (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p.9). “To minimize self-report biases, responses from the Student LPI-Observer are used in the analyses, rather than responses from the Student LPI-Self” (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p.9).

Face validity is a subjective evaluation of the survey instrument to determine if by appearances, when logically viewing the results, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure. The LPI was established and improved over many years from workshops in which participants described the practices of transformational leaders, the LPI therefore does in fact appear to have face validity (Kouzes & Posner, 2003).

The construct validity of the LPI was demonstrated by using factor analysis which demonstrates how much an, “instrument item measure common or different content” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p.11). “The evaluations of student leaders by their constituents (chapter or council members) are consistently and directly correlated with assessments of the extent to which these leaders engage in The Five Practices of Exemplary Student Leadership®” (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p.9). In one study, the LPI scores explained over 55 percent (p < .0001) of the variance in work group effectiveness (as conceptualized along six dimensions) (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p.11) . In another study, LPI scores were used to successfully predict performance levels of managers (p < .0001) (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p.11).

Concurrent validity has been reviewed by comparing the LPI to other instruments. “Correlations with other sociological and psychological instruments further enhance confidence that the LPI measures what it is purported to measure and not some other phenomenon” (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b, p.11). The LPI has been compared with
numerous other study areas from motivation to public health to Myers-Briggs Type Indicators to self esteem and many more and found to satisfactorily measure levels of leadership. All of these findings are relatively consistent both within and across U.S.-based and non-U.S.-based organizations and countries around the globe.

Reliability and validity of Achieving Styles Inventory.

Developed from over 25 years of research, including 14 revisions, and used with more than 40,000 participants, the Achieving Style Institute (2002) reported that the validity and reliability of the instrument were very strong.

The ASI showed good to excellent internal scale consistency. The Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .72 to .89. In a 15 week test-retest of high school students, the ASI showed internal consistency estimates over time ranging from .66 to .90 for the scales. Stability coefficients ranged from .58 on the Intrinsic Direct scale to .73 on both Social Instrumental and Competitive Direct scales. These results are similar to estimates with larger samples (Beardsley et al., 1987).

When examining reliability of the ASI, Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt split their sample into two age groups—those under 30 years of age and those 30 or older. For the nine scales in the less than 30 age group the range is from .72 for the reliant instrumental scale to .84 for the collaborative relational scale. “Domain stratified alphas exceed .80 for both samples and test item mean alphas exceed .90” (Scroggs, 1994, p.59). The instrument exhibited strong factorial validity for seven of nine scales in both age samples (Lipman-Blumen et al., 1983)
Data Collection Procedures

The researcher received permission to use the Student Leadership Practices Inventory from James Kouzes and Barry Posner; and the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory from the Achieving Styles Institute for research purposes. In addition, the researcher had received approval and authorization from the Ohio University Institutional Review Board to conduct research. After the researcher had been granted the clearance to begin research, the researcher visited the presidents’ meeting for all fraternity and sorority presidents hosted by Campus Life for Greek Life. At this meeting, the researcher explained the purpose of the research and asked each president to participate in the study. Although presidents were encouraged to participate in the study, they had the opportunity to decline to participate. Lastly, all presidents were urged to be open and honest while completing the surveys because they would receive a summary of their individual results, as well as the overall results for the study.

Each president who agreed to participate in the study was given a packet of information. Then, the researcher thoroughly explained the contents of the packet to the participants and stressed that completion of the surveys equated to granting their consent to partake in the study. Each packet of information contained:

1. A participation letter. (Appendix A)
2. An instructional letter discussing how to complete the Student LPI- Self form. (Appendix C)
3. One Student LPI- Self form. (Appendix E)
4. Instructions (including a user id and password) for the online version of the ASI. (Appendix G)
5. One Demographic Data form. (Appendix K)

During the meeting, each president completed the *Student LPI- Self* form (Appendix E), the online version of the ASI (Appendix H), and the Demographic Data form (Appendix K).

Additionally, the researcher randomly and systematically selected four members from each fraternity and sorority chapter or council, and asked them each to complete a *Student LPI- Observer* form and return the form to Campus Life by the established deadline. Using the fraternity and sorority chapter and council rosters located in the Department of Campus Life, the researcher selected the every 15th member on an individual chapter’s roster, and the every 3rd member on a governing council’s roster.

Each member received a packet of information that contained the following information:

1. A participation letter. (Appendix B)
2. An instructional letter discussing how to complete the *Student LPI- Observer* form. (Appendix D)
3. One *Student LPI- Observer* form. (Appendix F)
4. One envelope for the *Student LPI- Observer* form.

To complement the researcher’s statistical analysis and in order to better understand how fraternity and sorority leaders view themselves as leaders, the researcher adopted a qualitative method to explore the research questions. This qualitative method of data collection allowed for the voices of the participants to further shape the research findings. The researcher convened four separate focus group interviews, each consisting of between 4 and 6 presidents. By facilitating the focus groups, a less structured approach
allow[ed] for the discussion to develop based on the interaction of the participants as opposed to answering specific questions (Morgan, 2002). To facilitate discussion, each participant was given an index card that briefly explained the research and overall goal of the focus group. The index card also listed the themes that emerged from the statistical analysis of the data as well as questions regarding individual results. In addition, participants were given verbal instructions that the themes and questions were merely suggestions and that they should feel free to take the discussion in whatever direction the group felt most comfortable. For a list of themes and questions please see Appendix J. For ease of transcription, the focus group interviews were audio taped. All data were collected during winter quarter of 2007.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. With respect to descriptive statistics, means were used to summarize self-described leadership behaviors and achieving styles for the total fraternity and sorority lead were calculated to provide insight into the variability of the group scores. Pearson r correlation statistics were conducted to examine the relationship between fraternity and sorority self described leadership behaviors and achieving styles. An independent t-test was conducted to determine significant differences between individual groups and to compare the means of self--described leadership behaviors and achieving style scores of fraternity and sorority leaders. Despite the fifteen independent t-tests and correlation analyses that were conducted, this study was exploratory in nature in order to minimize the chance for Type I error. As such, the Bonferroni method was used to control for a Type I error. The Bonferroni alpha was .003. A univariate approach was used in this study because the N
was too small to use multivariate analysis. The following section describes the analysis for each hypothesis and sub-hypotheses. (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2

Summary of Hypotheses, Variable Descriptions and Statistical Tests (confidence level .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable(s)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is no relationship between self described leadership behaviors (Student LPI) and achieving styles (ASI) of fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Achieving Styles</td>
<td>Self Described Leadership Behaviors</td>
<td>Pearson $r$ Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are no significant differences in how fraternity and sorority leaders describe their leadership behaviors and their followers’ description of these behaviors on the Student LPI.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>Self Described Leadership Behaviors</td>
<td>Independent $t$-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There are no significant differences by gender in preferred leadership behaviors of fraternity and sorority leaders on each of the Student LPI practices.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>Self Described Leadership Behaviors</td>
<td>Independent $t$-Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the practice of Modeling for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>Modeling leadership practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the practice of Inspiring for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>Inspiring leadership practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2 Continued</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>( Challenging ) leadership practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the practice of ( Challenging ) for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>( Enabling ) leadership practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the practice of ( Enabling ) for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>( Encouraging ) leadership practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the practice of ( Encouraging ) for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader; Follower</td>
<td>( Encouraging ) leadership practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There are no significant differences by gender in achieving styles of selected leaders on each of the ( ASI ) scales.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>Achieving Styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the ( Intrinsic ) domain of the ( Direct ) style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>( Intrinsic ) Domain of the ( Direct ) Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the ( Competitive ) domain of the ( Direct ) style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>( Competitive ) Domain of the ( Direct ) Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the ( Power ) domain of the ( Direct ) style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>( Power ) Domain of the ( Direct ) Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the ( Collaborative ) domain of the ( Relational ) style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>( Collaborative ) Domain of the ( Relational ) Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4e. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the Contributory domain of the Relational style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</th>
<th>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</th>
<th>Contributory Domain of the Relational Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4f. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the Vicarious domain of the Relational style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>Vicarious Domain of the Relational Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the Entrusting Domain of the Instrumental Style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>Entrusting Domain of the Instrumental Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the Social domain of the Instrumental style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>Social Domain of the Instrumental Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4i. There is no significant difference between genders regarding the Personal domain of the Instrumental style for fraternity and sorority leaders.</td>
<td>Fraternity and Sorority Leader</td>
<td>Personal Domain of the Instrumental Style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the statistical data had been analyzed to identify themes and ideas, the focus group data was analyzed. The researcher transcribed all audio taped focus groups and then extracted specific answers and examples using the participants’ own words. The goal of analyzing focus group data was not to uncover new themes or ideas, but to verify the themes or ideas uncovered in the statistical analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Introduction

Results of this study are presented and discussed in this chapter. The discussion will be based on the correlation analysis of dependent and independent variables, analysis of student leadership behaviors and analysis of student leadership behaviors by gender. An analysis of achieving styles by gender was also conducted, and those findings will be presented as well. A qualitative analysis was done to better understand how fraternity and sorority leaders view themselves as leaders. Those findings will be presented as well.

Analysis of Data

Of the 30 fraternity and sorority presidents eligible to participate, 16 were males and 14 were females. Thirteen males (81.25%) and twelve (85.71%) females returned completed surveys. Five chapter presidents—3 males and 2 females, did not return the surveys and therefore were not included in the study. Four chapters were ineligible to participate due to either suspension or having a chapter membership fewer than five. Of the 100 chapter/council members asked to observe the presidents, eighty-four, or 3.36 followers per leader, returned the Student LPI-Observer form. Of the 84 members, forty-three (51.20%) were men, and forty-one (48.80%) were women.

The mean GPA of the fraternity and sorority leaders is 3.196 out of a 4.0 scale with a standard deviation of .433. The range of GPAs was 2.353 to 3.861. The mean for the male presidents was 3.110 out of a 4.0 scale with a standard deviation of .405. The mean for the female presidents was 3.289 out of a 4.0 scale with a standard deviation of .367. The average age for all the presidents was 21 years. The oldest presidents were 22
years old and the youngest presidents were 20 years old. Of the 25 presidents that participated, seventeen of them were seniors and eight were juniors. Of the seventeen presidents classified as seniors, seven (41.18%) were male and ten (58.82%) were female. Of the eight presidents classified as juniors, six (75%) were male and two (25%) were female. There were no freshmen or sophomores reported.

The fraternity and sorority presidents reported they had held membership in an average of 2.64 student organizations the previous year, and are currently members of an average of 2.88 organizations. In regards to previous leadership positions, they reported they had held an average of 2.72 positions. They indicated they currently hold an average of 1.68 positional leadership roles. This number includes their position as chapter/council president. Presidents were asked to respond to the following statement: During and since high school, I found myself in a leadership role: 1) rarely; 2) once in a while; 3) sometimes; 4) fairly often; 5) frequently. Of the 25 presidents responding, 12 (48%) indicated frequently, 8 (32%) said fairly often, 4 (16%) said sometimes, and 1 (4%) said once in a while. No one responded ‘rarely’ to the statement.

*Inter-Correlation of Variables*

The following null hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance:

There is no relationship between self described leadership behaviors (*Student LPI*) and achieving styles (*ASI*) of fraternity and sorority leaders.

The *Student Leadership Practices Inventory* (*Student LPI*) scales served as the dependent variables for this analysis. They are *Model the Way* (*Modeling*), *Inspire a Shared Vision* (*Inspiring*), *Challenge the Process* (*Challenging*), *Enable Others to Act* (*Enabling*), and *Encourage the Heart* (*Encouraging*). The three scales of the *Achieving*...
Styles Inventory (ASI) --Direct, Relational, and Instrumental served as the extraneous variables. The following table (Table 4.1) illustrates the results of the correlation analysis of these variables and shows the relationship to each other.

Table 4.1

Inter-Correlations between The Student LPI Scales and ASI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SLPI- Modeling</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.786*</td>
<td>.578*</td>
<td>.422*</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>- .090</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>- .344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SLPI- Inspiring</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.681*</td>
<td>.673*</td>
<td>.488*</td>
<td>- .190</td>
<td>- .073</td>
<td>- .238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SLPI- Challenging</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.745*</td>
<td>.542**</td>
<td>- .189</td>
<td>- .056</td>
<td>- .105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SLPI- Enabling</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.499*</td>
<td>- .245</td>
<td>- .114</td>
<td>- .004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SLPI- Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .073</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ASI- Direct</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.461*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.497*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ASI- Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ASI- Relational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. **Correlation is significant at p < .01, two-tailed.

Note. *Correlation is significant at p < .05, two-tailed.

The above analysis indicates a significant, moderate to strong relationship among dependent variables, which means they are inter-related and may have some effect on one another. As stated before, internal reliability for the LPI and Student LPI is quite strong. All five leadership practices have internal reliability scores that are above .75. In this analysis, there are no significant relationships between the Student LPI scales and ASI...
scales. While the analysis showed that there were no significant relationships between the Student LPI scales and the ASI scales, it did however show that the Student LPI scales were related to one another, and the ASI scales were related to one another. The Student LPI scales have a relationship with one another because they assess and measure the frequency of use of leadership behaviors. The ASI scales have a relationship with one another because they assess the “preferred strategies” used to accomplish tasks. Therefore, this analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.

**Analysis of Student Leadership Behaviors**

The following null hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance:

There are no significant differences in how fraternity and sorority leaders describe their leadership behaviors and their followers’ description of these behaviors on the Student LPI.

Table 4.2 illustrates the means, standard deviations (SD) and t-test results for this hypothesis. This table represents the differences in how leaders describe and view themselves and how they are perceived by their followers.
Table 4.2

_t-Test Results of Student Leadership Practices Inventory Scales:_

**Leaders versus Followers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means Leaders (n=25)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Means Followers (n=84)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p&gt;t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>23.48</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>-.837</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>-1.465</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>24.48</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-.449</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The _t_-test results for leaders (presidents) and followers (members) show there are no significant differences between how the leaders depict themselves in reference to the _Student LPI_ scales and how their followers depict them. The followers describe the leaders much like the leaders describe themselves. Leaders viewed themselves as utilizing _Enabling, Encouraging_, and _Inspiring_ more frequently. Followers described the leaders as utilizing _Enabling, Encouraging_, and _Modeling_ more frequently. Both leaders and followers described the leaders as utilizing _Challenging_ less frequently. The variables’ effect sizes ranged from small to medium to small, which means there was little difference between the leaders’ and followers’ descriptions of the leader as it relates to the _Student LPI_ scales. Their descriptions tended to be similar and had a greater chance of overlapping. The probability is more than 5% on any one test of the null hypothesis that fraternity and sorority leaders describe their leadership behaviors differently than
their followers’ description of these behaviors on the Student LPI. Therefore, the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Analysis of Student Leadership Behaviors by Gender

Table 4.3 presents the means, standard deviations (SD), and t-test results for the following null hypothesis:

There are no significant differences by gender in preferred leadership behaviors of fraternity and sorority leaders on each of the Student LPI practices.

Table 4.3

t-Test Results of Student Leadership Practices Inventory Scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means Male (n=13)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Means Female (n=12)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p&gt;t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring</td>
<td>23.67</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td>23.63</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no significant differences in the means of males and females on the dependent variables, or Student LPI scales. Since all of the variables have large effect sizes, it reflected the increasing lack of overlap between males and females as it relates to the Student LPI scales. When the variances were examined on the dependent variables,
the differences were not statistically significant. The probability is more than 5% on any one test of the null hypothesis that the average male (fraternity) score on the Student LPI is less than the average female (sorority) score on the Student LPI. Therefore, the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Analysis of Achieving Styles by Gender

An analysis was done to determine if achieving styles differed among the fraternity and sorority leaders based on gender. The following null hypothesis states:

There are no significant differences by gender in achieving styles of selected leaders on each of the ASI scales.

This analysis in Table 4.4 presents the means, standard deviations (SD), and t-test results for each of the Achieving Styles and their domains.
Table 4.4

$t$-Test Results of Achieving Styles Inventory Scales:

Male versus Female

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means Male (n=13)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Means Female (n=12)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p&gt;t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Intrinsic</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Competitive</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.970</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Power</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Collaborative</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Contributory</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Vicarious</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Entrusting</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Social</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Personal</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.776</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Indicates the domain of the Achieving Style.

The test results showed no significant differences between men and women on any of the variables – *Direct, Relational, or Instrumental*. Conversely, the test results of this analysis showed significant differences between men and women on the *Competitive (Direct)* and *Social (Instrumental)* domains. The effect sizes for these variables ranged from large to medium. The effect size for the *direct* variable reflected the increasing lack
of overlap between males and females as it relates to the ASI scales. However, the effect sizes for the Relational and Instrumental variables reflected little difference between the two distributions of scores as it relates to the ASI scales and had an increased chance of overlapping. Therefore, this analysis has failed to reject the null hypothesis.

The maximum and minimum scores on the Direct scales range from 4.47 to 6.07 for males and 3.33 to 6.00 for females. On the Relational scales, the scores range from 2.87 to 6.53 for males and 3.47 to 5.87 for females. Yet, the scores on the Instrumental scales range from 3.60 to 5.73 for males and 3.47 to 5.53 for females.

The fraternity presidents, or males, preferred the Direct style of achieving most often and the sorority presidents, or females, preferred the Relational style of achieving most often. Both males and females preferred the Instrumental style of achieving the least. When viewing each domain separately, males and females preferred utilizing Power most frequently. On the other hand, males tended to utilize the Personal domain less frequently and females tended to utilize the Competitive domain less frequently.

Comments from Focus Groups

"Leadership is the ability to establish standards and manage a creative climate where people are self-motivated toward the mastery of long term constructive goals, in a participatory environment of mutual respect, compatible with personal values” (Mike Vance, 2007, www.leadershipnow.com).

Comments from the fraternity and sorority presidents interviewed helped to enrich the statistical findings of this study. In order to guide the interview with the presidents, there were several questions posted to each of them. In the interview and conversations with the participants, the issues related to these questions were clearly interconnected and
intricately weaved throughout their performance as president. Participants were not only responding to the questions, but attempting to make sense of their individual leadership behaviors and achieving styles as it related to their experiences.

Many definitions of leadership arose from the question, ‘What is your definition of leadership?’ One student leader defined leadership as “Developing characteristics to be able to have the ability to adapt to any given situation, while also motivating/inspiring individuals around you; the ability to influence.” A second student defined leadership as “Having the ability to recognize [her] strengths and weaknesses as well as those of group members. They can utilize this knowledge to direct and motivate the group towards accomplishing the vision/goal. Basically, leadership is the process of an individual motivating and directing a group towards accomplishing a goal.”

A third student stated, “Leadership is the ability to develop a vision and the skills to motivate others to achieve that vision.” A fourth student offered that leadership is “[Having the] ability to motivate/manipulate someone or group to act or think a certain way.” A fifth student suggested, “Leadership is a role that has an important impact on the participants and the goal. It involves sharing, encouraging, and trust.” A sixth student responded, “My definition of leadership is someone who leads by example and acts how he/she would like to see others act. They give guidance to those who need it and help encourage people to act in a positive way and help the organization reach their ultimate goal.” Additional definitions from students included:

- “Someone who can guide other members, provide support for those in your group and provide a role model for others to look to. Someone who can stand up and take initiative.”
• “Organizing of groups, understanding each individual.”
• “Leading a group and making them feel welcome and getting people involved.”
• “Taking initiative to complete a goal/task.”
• “Leadership is taking your group’s vision and being able to do the things to carry out that vision while motivating the group to follow you there.”
• “Being in a role where you guide others to work together to attain a common goal. Being a positive influence.”
• “Someone who can listen and give advice. A person who can steer people toward a goal in a non-tyrannical way.”
• “Someone that is a role model seven days a week, 24 hours a day.”

"You cannot be a leader, and ask other people to follow you, unless you know how to follow, too." — Sam Rayburn (www.leadershipnow.com, 2007)

When fraternity and sorority leaders were asked to describe their leadership style, their responses varied. One student indicated, “I, practice what I preach.” If I want a group to do something or act a certain way I make sure that I am doing it. Also I always listen, no matter if it’s a big issue or a small one I treat them the same and listen very intently to the person.” A second student described themselves as “… [A] laid-back, yet motivated leader. I am very hands on and want to know what is happening at each point during the duration of the task. I also am able to delegate responsibility to others so they are able to grow as leaders.” A third student stated, “I consider myself strict when the need arises, however I make sure to remember that, in the end, I am simply a peer of the people I lead.” A fourth student pointed out, “I feel as though I lead by example, trying
to get as many people as possible involved. I try to ask for help in getting people more active and distributing responsibility.”

*Gender and leadership style.*

When posed the questions, “Does gender make a difference in a person’s leadership style? Why or why not?” one male student replied, “Yes, I think gender does make a difference. Men are more demanding and willing to hand out tasks and men respond to a task, where as women are more hesitant to micromanage and try to do a lot of their leading on their own.” A second male student said, “I don’t believe that gender plays a role in a person’s leadership style, but the perceptions a of a person’s leadership style depend on if they are male or female. A male being led by a female might feel that the female is inadequate to lead even if she is completely qualified and has the skills necessary.” A third male student responded, “I think the gender of the people a person leads affects the leadership style. It is my opinion that males and females respond differently to different leadership tactics”. A fourth male student stated, “I don’t think males and females lead differently, it’s just the positions we are put into can be different and therefore different situations lead to different outcomes.”

One female responded to the previous question in this manner, “I think gender does make a difference. One isn’t better than the other. Men may be stronger in some areas, whereas women are more emotional.” A second female stated, “Women are more willing to listen, are more sympathetic, and are more caring towards people. Men are more aggressive, more forceful, and don’t want to take the time to talk through a situation before acting on it.” A third female student said, “Yes! Absolutely! Women and men do lead differently because we have different expectations and standards. Women [tend to]
care about details and can even become nit-picky about the littlest things, but men don’t
get bogged down in details.” A fourth female student indicated, “Men are usually better
at making decisions and women are usually better at executing the decisions.”

**Student LPI reflections.**

When the fraternity and sorority presidents were invited to think about and
discuss their **Student LPI- Self** results. A male student replied, “Of the **SLPI** results, I
scored highest on **Challenge the Process** and lowest on **Encourage the Heart**. I agree
with the results, because I feel that I make every attempt possible to change what is
current to make it fit better with the system. I also feel that I do have some issues with
encouraging others and by showing my true appreciation. Although I am always very
appreciative of what others have accomplished, I have issues showing my gratitude.”

Another male student reflected, “My highest was celebrate accomplishments [\( Encourage
the Heart \)], sets personal example [\( Model the Way \)]; lowest was help others take risks
[\( Challenge the Process \)], gives others freedom and choice [\( Enable Others to Act \)]. I
agree with these results as I believe they reflect my leadership style.” A third male
student said, “I agree with **Model the Way** being high, but not **Encourage the Heart**
being so low. I think I am a sensitive guy that recognizes when people are doing a good
job.”

Sorority presidents responded differently to this question. One female student
indicated, “I disagree with **Model the Way** being my third highest score. I really thought
that [score] would have been much higher because I feel that I try to set examples for the
ladies I am leading. Other than that, I agree with everything else, particularly **Challenge
the Process** being the lowest [score]. I don’t like conflict.” A second female student
replied, “Yes. I wholeheartedly agree with my depiction of myself. I like to reward, motivate, and inspire people.” Another female student responded, “I kind of thought the Enable Others to Act would have been higher than Encourage the Heart because I am not a ‘touchy-feely’ kind of girl. But I can live with the results.”

When the fraternity and sorority presidents were invited to think about and discuss their Student LPI- Observer results, one response was, “They are mostly similar to my [(Student LPI- Self)] results. I really agree with all of them. It was a very accurate reading of me.” Another response, “I feel that I can agree with all of the results from the observers. Some of the individuals might feel that I wasn’t a solid leader and some felt I was great.” An additional response, “The scores are right on target. It’s like they have known me all of my life!” These observations are consistent with the statistical findings that followers describe the leaders much like the leaders describe themselves.

Achieving style and leadership.

Fraternity and sorority presidents were also asked to consider their ASI results and reflect upon the way they accomplish goals and tasks within their chapter/council. One president stated, “I feel that the results of the ASI are reflective of how I led my council during my time as president. I would try to model how I wanted to other individuals to lead, and would certainly challenge the status quo. The most difficult part of my job as president of [my council] was encouraging others to step up and do better, and this was reflected in the ASI results.” Another president replied, “My results [for the ASI] do reflect the way I accomplish goals and make plans for projects, support the decisions others make and celebrate accomplishments.” Another president stated, “Yes, my ASI
results are accurate. The methods that this report says I use tend to agree with my leadership style.”

Final thoughts.

Finally, after reviewing all of their results, the fraternity and sorority presidents were asked if the results of their inventories would change the way they led. One student leader indicated, “I don’t think I would change anything about the way I lead. I like the qualities I have and I think that is why I am a good leader.” A second student stated, “After reviewing the results, I don’t believe that I will change the way I lead, but I will grow. As I grow and mature I am likely to change my leadership style, but as of right now my leadership seems to be working.” A third student responded, “No, I am content with my style and feel it has been successful. I don’t model the successfulness of my leadership style based on answers to questions from some study. I look at the results I attain and whether or not the people I lead respond to my actions. So far I feel I have been successful.”

It was clear from the discussions that fraternity and sorority leaders in this study wanted to gain awareness of their own leadership style and then learn how to act upon them. Consequently, they wanted to improve on the skills they already had as leaders as well as learn new ones. In essence, these student leaders were looking to learn more about their strengths, weaknesses, and tendencies in order to become an effective leader. They wanted to be able to use the knowledge gained from this study throughout the rest of their lives, as well as continue educating themselves about ever changing leadership behaviors and achieving styles.
CHAPTER FIVE
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to assess aspects, behaviors and characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership among fraternity and sorority leaders. This research strived to show the relationship between their self-described leadership behaviors and how those behaviors are perceived by their followers. The relationship between their transformational leadership behaviors and their achieving styles were investigated, and achieving style differences based on gender was also examined.

This research attempted to find the differences between fraternity and sorority leaders regarding the five leadership practices as measured by the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) (Appendices E and F), their achieving styles as measured by the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI) (Appendix H), and their descriptive information specific to their own situations as measured by focus group interview sessions (Appendix J). Specifically, five questions guided the design of this study: (a) What are fraternity and sorority leaders’ self-described leadership behaviors and achieving styles? (b) Are there significant differences between how these leaders describe their leadership styles and their followers’ descriptions of these styles? (c) What is the relationship between fraternity and sorority leaders’ self-reported achieving styles and their self-assessed leadership behaviors? (d) What is the relationship between the followers’ assessment of fraternity and sorority leaders’ behaviors and those leaders’
achieving styles? and (e) Do fraternity and sorority leaders have different achieving styles according to gender?

The following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. There is no relationship between self described leadership behaviors (Student LPI) and achieving styles (ASI) of fraternity and sorority leaders.

2. There are no significant differences in how fraternity and sorority leaders describe their leadership behaviors and their followers’ description of these behaviors on the Student LPI.

3. There are no significant differences by gender in preferred leadership behaviors of fraternity and sorority leaders on each of the Student LPI practices.

4. There are no significant differences by gender in achieving styles of selected leaders on each of the ASI scales.

The population used in this study were men and women who were serving as fraternity and sorority presidents at Ohio University during the fall 2006 quarter. During a quarterly meeting of all fraternity and sorority chapter and council presidents, the researcher handed out a packet of information and explained the purpose of the study, which was to determine leadership and achieving styles of fraternity and sorority leaders. The student leaders were asked to complete the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) and the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI). The researcher assured all participants that their individual scores and results would be shared with them during the data collection period, and conveyed they would be invited to participate in a focus group interview session regarding their results.
Each chapter and council president was given a demographic data sheet, a Student LPI- Self form, and instructions on how to complete the ASI. The researcher explained to the presidents that four randomly selected members of their chapter or council would be asked to complete the Student LPI- Observer form on their behalf. Randomly selected members included officers, general members, and members who lived in the chapter house, in a residence hall, or off-campus. All members were mailed a packet of information which include the Student LPI- Observer form and were strongly advised to return the form to the researcher by the stated deadline. All students were informed that participation in the study was voluntary and confidential.

The instruments used were coded so a president’s and members’ surveys remained together. Any president who did not attend the meeting was mailed the packet of information and asked to complete and submit the surveys by the established deadline. Throughout the data collection period reminder emails were sent to both presidents and members. At the end of the two week data collection period 20 surveys had been returned by presidents and 72 surveys had been returned by members. A follow-up email was sent to presidents and members, and an additional 5 surveys from presidents and 12 surveys from members were returned.

After the surveys were analyzed, each fraternity and sorority president were given their individual results and asked to participate in a focus group interview session. The presidents were asked to give a definition of leadership and to articulate their thoughts regarding their results (i.e. Did they agree with their individual results? Why or why not?). Then they were asked to describe their leadership style and how they go about
accomplishing goals. In closing, a discussion regarding leadership and gender, and the impact of their results on their leadership style ensued.

Summary of the Data Analysis

The data for this study was presented and analyzed in Chapter Four. Descriptive statistics including information on age, grade point average (GPA), year in school (freshman, sophomore, junior or senior), number of organizations to which they belonged the previous and current year, and previous leadership experiences. Means and standard deviations for each dependent variable and results of the t-tests were displayed in various tables.

Of the 30 fraternity and sorority presidents eligible to participate, 16 were males and 14 were females. Thirteen males (81.25%) and twelve (85.71%) females returned completed surveys. Of the 100 chapter/council members asked to observe the presidents, eighty-four, or 3.36 followers per leader, returned the Student LPI- Observer form. Of the 84 members, forty-three (51.20%) were men, and forty-one (48.80%) were women.

The mean GPA of the fraternity and sorority leaders is 3.196 out of a 4.0 scale with a standard deviation of .433. The range of GPAs was 2.353 to 3.861. The mean for the male presidents was 3.110 out of a 4.0 scale with a standard deviation of .405. The mean for the female presidents was 3.289 out of a 4.0 scale with a standard deviation of .367. The average age for all the presidents was 21 years. The oldest presidents were 22 years old and the youngest presidents were 20 years old. Of the 25 presidents that participated, seventeen of them were seniors and eight were juniors. Of the seventeen presidents classified as seniors, seven (41.18%) were male and ten (58.82%) were female.
Of the eight presidents classified as juniors, six (75%) were male and two (25%) were female. There were no freshmen or sophomores reported.

The fraternity and sorority presidents reported they had held membership in an average of 2.64 student organizations the previous year, and are currently members of an average of 2.88 organizations. In regards to previous leadership positions, they reported they had held an average of 2.72 positions. They indicated they currently hold an average of 1.68 positional leadership roles. This number includes their position as chapter/council president. In final, presidents were asked to respond to the following statement: During and since high school, I found myself in a leadership role: 1) rarely; 2) once in a while; 3) sometimes; 4) fairly often; 5) frequently. Of the 25 presidents responding, 12 (48%) indicated frequently, 8 (32%) said fairly often, 4 (16%) said sometimes, and 1 (4%) said once in a while. No one responded ‘rarely’ to the statement.

Findings for null hypothesis one.

The first null hypothesis examined the relationship between The Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) scales – Model the Way (Modeling), Inspire a Shared Vision (Inspiring), Challenge the Process (Challenging), Enable Others to Act (Enabling), and Encourage the Heart (Encouraging); and the Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI) – Direct, Relational, and Instrumental. The Student LPI scales served as the dependent variables and the ASI scales served as extraneous variables. In this analysis, there were no significant relationships between the Student LPI scales and ASI scales. While the analysis showed that there were no significant relationships between the Student LPI scales and the ASI scales, it did however show that the Student LPI scales were related to one another, and the ASI scales were related to one another. The Student
LPI scales have a relationship with one another because they assess and measure the frequency of use of leadership behaviors. The ASI scales have a relationship with one another because they assess the “preferred strategies” used to accomplish tasks.

Therefore, this analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Findings for null hypothesis two.

The second null hypothesis examined the differences in how leaders describe and view themselves and how they are perceived by their followers. The t-test results for leaders (presidents) and followers (members) showed no significant differences between how the leaders depict themselves in reference to the Student LPI scales and how their followers depict them. Therefore, the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Findings for null hypothesis three.

The third null hypothesis examined differences by gender in preferred leadership behaviors of fraternity and sorority leaders on each of the Student LPI practices. The probability was more than 5% on any one test of the null hypothesis that the average male (fraternity) score on the Student LPI is less than the average female (sorority) score on the Student LPI. Therefore, the analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Findings for null hypothesis four.

An analysis was done to determine if achieving styles differed among the fraternity and sorority leaders based on gender. The test results showed no significant differences between men and women on any of the ASI variables – Direct, Relational, or Instrumental. Therefore, this analysis failed to reject the null hypothesis.
Conclusions

Using a mixed method approach in this study allowed the statistical findings to be supported by the participants’ own descriptions, feelings, thoughts, and direct quotations regarding leadership behaviors and achieving styles. Based on this study, a number of conclusions can be drawn. These results are based upon the findings and review of literature on transformational leadership and achieving styles.

1. Fraternity and sorority presidents are transformational leaders.

The results of this study indicate fraternity and sorority presidents scored high on all of the Student LPI scales. In particular, fraternity and sorority presidents scored highest on Encourage the Heart (Encouraging), Enable Others to Act (Enabling), and Inspire a Shared Vision (Inspiring), which are known for describing transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics. Sorority presidents did score higher than fraternity presidents on Encourage the Heart and Enable Others to Act, but overall the fraternity and sorority presidents can be viewed as transformational leaders.

Membership in fraternities and sororities offers students many opportunities to develop their leadership potential. Fraternities and sororities not only provide training in the principles of leadership, they are laboratories in which these principles can be tested. Fraternity and sorority presidents are actively involved in modeling positive behavior, teaching and encouraging members to utilize their leadership talents, and developing a cohesive team in order to work towards common goals.

2. In reference to leadership styles, followers described leaders as the leaders described themselves.
Fraternity and sorority chapter/council members depicted their presidents as leaders who display and use transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics. “[Followers] are empowered, have various and numerous needs, and want to be able to see how following the leader is consistent with their own personal goals” (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p.225). Members viewed their presidents as adaptive leaders that help them and their organization succeed.

The absence of statistically significant differences between the leaders’ perceptions of themselves and the followers’ perceptions is an important finding. These findings reveal that these fraternity and sorority leaders are indeed engaging their followers in the leadership process. This speaks to the transforming portion of their leadership style. Transformational leaders connect with followers or members and motivate them to work for intangible goals instead of immediate self interests. The leader inspires and involves the organization’s members so they feel empowered. Comments and reflections from this study’s focus group interview sessions are consistent with the statistical findings that followers describe the leaders much like the leaders describe themselves.

When developing the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) Student Version, Posner and Brodsky (1992) found this to be true as well. When member of fraternities were asked to respond to statements on the LPI-Other, which described their presidents’ leadership characteristics, their responses were consistent with the presidents’ impressions of themselves.

Enabling others to act is an essential component of transformational leadership. Research has shown that a leader is described as transformational if he or she exhibits
any combination of the following behaviors: *idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation,* or *individualized consideration* (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass, 1990; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996; Judge & Bono, 2000).

Leaders who use transformational characteristics empower followers, motivate them by articulating a vision and are sensitive to follower needs and aspirations (Avolio & Bass, 1987; Bass, 1990; House et al., 1988; Roueche et al., 1989; Scroggs, 1994).

Lipman-Blumen took transformational leadership one step further and discussed it in terms of connecting individuals to task and groups. She described this kind of leadership as empowering followers and went beyond this by describing the leader as “reaching out to other leaders as allies rather than as adversaries or competitors” (Lipman-Blumen, 1993).

Followers of transformational leaders view themselves a part of the leadership process. According to Robert Greenleaf, followers are served if they “grow as persons… become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants” (1970, p.7). The leader communicates the vision and/or goals and encourages follower adoption of and collaboration in accomplishing them (Murray & Feitler, 1989).

In a study of 47 teams of workers in four Korean organizations, Jung and Sosik (2002) explored the relationships between transformational leadership, follower empowerment, and perceived group effectiveness. They found not only that transformational leaders empowered followers but also that empowerment enhanced the team’s collective sense of efficacy, which in turn led to enhanced perceptions of the work team’s effectiveness. The literature discussed follower satisfaction with transformational
leaders. However, the results of this study do not provide information regarding follower satisfaction.

3. Most often male and female presidents preferred to use the same leadership behaviors and styles when leading.

Both males and females preferred to employ the same leadership behaviors and styles when leading their organization. Males and females chose to Enable Others to Act on a more frequent basis and chose to Challenge the Process less frequently. Similar studies conducted with other leaders do not have like findings.

Kouzes and Posner’s Enable Others to Act is constructed around two concepts: 1) fostering collaboration and 2) strengthening others. Carol Gilligan states a central claim that men and women view relationships differently. In 1982, she found women more than men described themselves in terms of human relationships. According to Gilligan, men think in terms of rules and justice and women are more inclined to think in terms of caring and values. Therefore, it is not surprising to find the top two preferred leadership practices for women to be Enabling and Encouraging. Gilligan did find that as men mature, they begin to see and understand the importance of relationships and working together.

In 1991, Astin and Leland studied women leaders who valued having "influence" rather than "power" over others. These women leaders described using their leadership positions as a base from which they influenced others, developed networks of followers, who themselves became powerful agents for change. By empowering others, they saw the opportunity to create a collective force that worked together synergistically. The results
of this study’s analysis found females to prefer similar leadership styles to those in Astin and Leland’s study.

Both fraternity and sorority presidents utilized the practice *Inspire a Shared Vision* in order to lead their chapter or councils. This finding is consistent with the literature. Bass (1985) noted that vision is a very important aspect of transformational and charismatic leadership. Others who have studied transformational leaders have included vision as a component of this leadership style (Burns, 1978; Roueche et al., 1989; Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

Sashkin (1988) believed that a leader’s ability to communicate a vision is important in engaging followers in the task. Transformational leaders, both male and female, recognize the need to have a vision that followers can believe in and understand. In 1993, Lipman-Blumen used several women corporate leaders as example of how their vision sets the tone for their businesses and those who work for them. Astin and Leland (1991) also discussed the vision of women leaders in their study. Although these women led in different times and used different methods to accomplish their goals, they all had a vision for the future that was communicated to their followers.

As stated previously, both males and females scored the lowest on *Challenge the Process*, which means they prefer to practice this leadership style less frequently. It is unclear if both fraternity and sorority presidents are satisfied with maintaining the status quo or afraid to test their abilities and learn from their failures and disappointments. Additionally, it is unclear if they are unwilling to engage in risk taking behaviors as it pertains to leadership because they are fearful of the consequences or sanctions that may follow, or perhaps it is because fraternities and sororities are typically rooted in traditions
and history that are highly regarded and respected amongst its members, and challenging
the process or going against the standard way of operating would disturb those traditions
and change the course of history. Further research would be needed.

4. Male and female presidents prefer to utilize different achieving styles to
   accomplish their goals.

   Males in this study reported the Direct achieving style set as their most preferred
   achieving style set, followed by the Relational achieving style set. Females in this study
   reported the Relational achieving style set as their most preferred achieving style set,
   followed by the Direct achieving style set. Both males and females preferred the
   Instrumental achieving style set the least. These findings were consistent with the
   literature. However, this raises additional questions about the socialization of boys and
girls and the impact their socialization may have on what kind of organization they lead
   and how they lead the organization or in general.

   An individual’s characteristics and behaviors are due to the influence of both the
   environment and human nature. So what if as a society we decided to forgo socializing
   genders in specific ways? What if we stopped socializing and conditioning boys to just be
   assertive, competitive, and dominant? What if we stopped socializing and conditioning
   girls to just be sensitive, understanding, and compassionate? What kind of boys and girls
   would we have, and what type of leaders would they become? How would they perform
   academically and socially in school? As a society we need to focus on more gender-
   neutral methods of socialization that would create assertive, gentle, empathetic, adaptive,
   reliable, strong, and sincere boys and girls, who would eventually grow up to be adults
   that do not have to “prove” their own manhood or womanhood.
“People who prefer the direct set of behavioral styles tend to confront their own tasks individually and directly (hence the "direct" label), emphasizing mastery, competition, and power” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p.24). The individual may complete the task him or herself or delegate it to another person. The leader, however, does remain in control of the other person in the process (Lipman-Blumen et al., 1983). They prefer to “tightly control the definition of goals and the means used to accomplish them” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p120).

In this study, fraternity president’s preference for the Direct achieving style is consistent with the literature. Research has shown males are socialized to be competitive high achievers, and seek leadership roles (Lipman-Blumen et al., 1983). According to social role theory, women are cast as more communal, sympathetic, and nurturing; while men are seen as assertive, dominant, and forceful (Eagly & Karau, 2002). This may explain why the males in this study were more likely to prefer the Direct achieving style over the Relational or Instrumental styles.

Beardsley et al. (1987) found in their study of students’ achieving style preferences that they used Direct styles most often. The Direct styles were closely followed by Relational styles. Their findings were similar to those in this study for fraternity presidents. Nonetheless, sorority presidents preferred Relational achieving styles closely followed by Direct achieving styles.

Carol Gilligan (1982) pointed out in her studies that autonomy and action were associated with masculinity and considered less desirable characteristics for women. The females’ preference for the relational achieving styles is consistent with Gilligan’s studies of women development. Lipman-Blumen also found that women are encouraged to be
helpers and put others before themselves. This corresponds to the relational achieving style and supports the findings of this study.

The sorority presidents, or females, scored highest on the *Relational* scale of achieving styles, which means they are more likely to be interested in the group’s goals and objectives above their own. Lipman-Blumen (1993) found this type of achiever gets satisfaction from participating in other’s accomplishments. “People who prefer to work on group tasks or help others to attain their goals emphasize the *Relational* set” (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p.25). Lipman-Bluemen et al. (1983) in earlier studies pointed out that women are taught to have their achievement needs met through relationships with others. According to Lipman-Blumen (1993), people who favor this style like the camaraderie of working with others and feel devoted to the group and its goals, and know how to promote a sense of teamwork. The development of these relationships is part of the reward.

This may explain the fraternity and sorority presidents’ preferences for the *Relational* achieving style over the *Instrumental* achieving style. For those preferring the relational achieving style, relationships serve as the reward, while those who prefer the instrumental achieving style use relationships to assist in accomplishing the goal.

In 1991, Susan Komives published a study that looked at the gender differences between hall directors as it relates to leadership and achieving styles. She found that both men and women preferred relational achieving styles over direct or instrumental. Her findings are not consistent with the preferred styles of the fraternity and sorority leaders in this study. Although these students used relational achieving styles, only the females
used the style most often. Both fraternity and sorority presidents preferred the instrumental achieving style least often.

“Individuals who use themselves and others as instruments toward community goals” are said to prefer the instrumental set of style (Lipman-Blumen, 1996, p.25). This set of achieving styles is characterized by using informal systems and friendships to accomplish ones goals (Lipman-Blumen, 1996). Instrumental achievers have a strong political sensibility, are deemed as having the social touch, and recognize the importance of information. Fraternity and sorority presidents in this study scored lowest on the instrumental scale indicating they preferred the achieving style the least.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Action

For the last past decade an increasingly number of studies suggest that leadership programs, workshops and intentionally planned activities can help students develop and enhance leadership capacities (Cress et al., 2001; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999). Connotations for leadership development programs for this particular sample of leaders are significant. Student Affairs professionals try to prepare students for the future both academically and personally. Life and leadership co-exists beyond college, and as professionals, we strive to teach students how to use the skills gained today for success tomorrow. We work with students in a variety of roles and help them achieve scholastic, personal, and life goals. The findings of this study are valuable to those who are interested in cultivating and enhancing students’ leadership capacities to be more congruent with today’s relational leadership expectations.
Astin & Astin (2000) define leadership as bringing about change for the good or improvement of society. This definition implies that someone make a value judgment about what is in fact good for the institution or society. If we adopt what Astin & Astin (2000) say about leadership, then we must address personal values in leadership development programs. Personal values of transformational leaders are key elements of the leadership process. Therefore, less of the focus should be placed on skill development, due to students’ previous leadership experiences, and more emphasis placed on character development and values clarification.

Higher education professionals tend to view students in terms of the formal leadership positions they acquire and strive to create intentional programming for our students and the community based off of this view. However, this can place constraints upon the leadership development process because whether formally or informally, every student has the potential to be a leader. If we continue to focus on those who hold formal leadership positions, then we are missing the opportunity to create holistic learning environments. As it relates to this study, we are denying the chance to develop and transform followers into leaders. As student affairs professionals we should be encouraging all students to become aware of their own consciousness, challenge their thinking as it relates to collective purposes, and practice respect and integrity towards one another. “If student affairs staff can demonstrate patience and empathy for the leadership process as it unfolds, students will be more likely to reflect and incorporate these values themselves” (Astin & Astin, 2000, p.53).

Student affairs practitioners working with fraternity and sorority affairs should encourage interactive workshops that teach and create group process experiences and
engage students in active reflection on what they think leadership is and on this may be similar or different to what they thought leadership was (Komives et al., 2004). Through these workshops students might also be encouraged to meet and work together in their specific chapters or councils to set fraternity or sorority standards and expectations; discuss shared responsibilities within their chapter or council, as well as in the community; and engage in dialogue regarding the contributions each member makes to the group process (Komives et al., 2004).

Most leadership development programs for students do very little to discuss students’ desired achieving strategies. This study showed the relationship between achieving and leadership styles. Lipman-Blumen mentioned that these strategies are learned and people tend to use a variety of strategies to fit situations. It is important for educators to help students expand their knowledge of achieving style preferences to improve their effectiveness as leaders.

As educators we can assist students in development of effective communication skills. This study may conclude that if followers see leaders as transformational, then they are good communicators. A leader’s effectiveness in enlisting followers to adopt his or her vision is dependent on the leader’s ability to clearly articulate the vision (Scroggs, 1994). The findings of this study suggest that we should provide public speaking opportunities for our students, and create leadership development programs that teach different communication styles, approaches, and techniques; empathetic listening, and how to understand cultural communication patterns and styles. It would prove to be useless if a leader could not clearly communicate its vision in an adaptive language.


Recommendations for Further Research

Future research should be conducted in the area of leadership and multiculturalism. A majority of the leaders in this study led organizations that were mostly, if not completely, comprised of members who identify with being caucasian. Greek governing councils and individual chapters have ALANA (African, Latino/a, Asian, and Native American), LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender), and religious students, therefore there is a need for replication using various other samples of the student leader populations. A future study needs to include a wider, more diverse group of students that could assist in answering the questions, 1) Do men and women lead differently?, 2) Do multicultural students lead differently?, and 3) Do multicultural men and women lead differently than those men and women who identify as Caucasian?

Given that these organizations select their own members from groups of people who have expressed interest in membership, little is known about what impact this has on how leaders behave and operate in these groups. However, we do know the groups are moderately homogeneous, and it could be this homogeneity that makes it easier for leaders to be transformational. A study is needed to look at transformational leadership behaviors of non-fraternity and non-sorority leaders who lead organizations that have non-selective membership criteria. This is an area for further research.

Leadership behaviors and styles are constantly evolving in response to societal needs. Coaching and management leadership focus on how to engage followers in processes as a means of motivating them to get the job done. Followers, who are involved in the process, adopt goals of the organization as their own, are motivated internally rather than externally, and are better able to unleash their potential and talents. The role
of followers and their needs as members of organizations requires further study to
determine their part in the leadership and achieving style preferences of leaders.
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January 5, 2007

Greetings Chapter President!

My name is Danita M. Brown, Associate Director of Campus Life, and I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education program here at Ohio University. Along with my advisor and chair, Dr. Marc Cutright, I am working on dissertation research that examines the leadership characteristics and behaviors; and achieving styles of fraternity and sorority leaders here on campus.

I am respectfully requesting your participation in my research study by completing the *Student Leadership Practices Inventory* (Student LPI) and *L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory* (ASI). The *Student Leadership Practices Inventory* has two forms: *Student LPI-Self* and *Student LPI-Observer*. Both forms are comprised of thirty (30) statements, with responses given via a 5-point Likert scale that address the essential leadership behaviors of student leaders. If you choose to participate you will be asked to complete the *Student LPI-Self*. In addition, four (4) chapter or council members will be randomly selected by the researcher to complete the *Student LPI-Observer* on your behalf. You will also need to complete the online version of the *L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory*. The ASI is a forty-five (45) item Likert scale instrument, ranging from never (1) to always (7), that is used to measure respondents’ preference to use a particular task or set of behaviors (achieving styles) to achieve their objectives. **Completion of both inventories should take no more than 20 minutes.**

Additionally, after all of the statistical data has been collected from the *Student LPI-Self* and *Observer* forms, and *L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory*, you will be invited to participate in a focus group to better provide an interpretive lens in which to better understand how fraternity and sorority leaders view themselves as leaders.
Please be advised that all information is strictly confidential. Completion and return of the inventories implies consent to use the data for research purposes. Today you will be given a packet containing the following items:

1. A participation letter.

2. An instructional letter discussing how to complete the Student LPI-
   Self form.

3. One Student LPI- Self form.

4. Instructions (including a user id and password) for the online version
   of the ASI.

5. One Demographic Data form.

**Please read all instructions carefully before completing each inventory.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 740-593-4030 or brownd9@ohio.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

Thank you in advance.

Danita M. Brown

Associate Director, Campus Life

Baker University Center
Athens, Ohio 45701
(740) 593-4030
brownd9@ohio.edu

Advisor contact information:

Dr. Marc Cutright
340 McCracken Hall
Athens, Ohio 45701
(740)-593-4459
cutrighm@ohio.edu
January 5, 2007

Greetings Chapter/Council Member!

   My name is Danita M. Brown, Associate Director of Campus Life, and I am currently a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education program here at Ohio University. Along with my advisor and chair, Dr. Marc Cutright, I am working on dissertation research that examines the leadership characteristics and behaviors; and achieving styles of fraternity and sorority leaders here on campus.

   I am respectfully requesting your participation in my research study by completing the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) - Observer form on the behalf of your chapter or council president who was in office during fall quarter 2006. The form is comprised of thirty (30) statements, with responses given via a 5-point Likert scale that address the essential leadership behaviors of student leaders and should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. The president of your chapter or council has agreed to participate in the study.

   Please be advised that all information is strictly confidential. Completion and return of the inventory implies consent to use the data for research purposes. If you choose to participate in this research study, please complete the Student LPI-Observer form and return it in the envelope provided to: Campus Life, 355 Baker University Center, by Friday, January 19, 2007. Please read all instructions carefully before completing the inventory.

   If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 740-593-4030 or brownd9@ohio.edu. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

   Thank you in advance.
Danita M. Brown,

Associate Director, Campus Life
Baker University Center
Athens, Ohio 45701
(740) 593-4030
brownd9@ohio.edu

Advisor contact information:

Dr. Marc Cutright
340 McCracken Hall
Athens, Ohio 45701
(740)-593-4459
cutrighm@ohio.edu
APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE STUDENT LPI- SELF FORM

On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate yourself in terms of how frequently you engage in the behavior described. This is not a test (there are no right or wrong answers). The usefulness of the feedback from this inventory will depend on how honest you are with yourself and how frequently you actually engage in each of these behaviors.

Consider each statement in the context of one student organization with which you are now (or have been most) involved with. This organization could be a club, a team, chapter, group, unit, hall, program, project, and the like. As you respond to each statement, maintain a consistent perspective to your particular organization. The rating scale provides five choices. Circle the number that best applies to each statement;

1. If you RARELY or SELDOM do what is described
2. If you do what is described ONCE IN A WHILE
3. If you SOMETIMES do what is described
4. If you OFTEN do what is described
5. If you VERY FREQUENTLY or ALMOST ALWAYS do what is described

In selecting the response, be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you would like to see yourself or in terms of what you should be doing. Answer in terms of how you typically behave.

For example, the first statement is “I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.” If you believe you do this once in a while, circle the number 2. If you believe you do this often, circle the number 4. Select and circle only one option (response number) for each statement.

Please respond to every statement. If you can’t respond to a statement (or feel that it doesn’t apply), circle a 1. When you have responded to all thirty statements, please turn to the response sheet on the back page and transfer your responses as instructed.

Copyright 2004 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.
APPENDIX D: INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE STUDENT LPI- OBSERVER FORM

On the next two pages are thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully. Then rate the person who asked you to complete this form in terms of how frequently he or she typically engages in the behavior described. This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. The usefulness of the feedback from this inventory will depend on how honest you are in your assessment of the other person.

Consider each statement in the context of one student organization with which you have been most involved with this person or in which you have had the greatest opportunity to observe him or her. This organization could be a club, a team, chapter, group, unit, hall, program, project, and the like. As you respond to each statement, maintain a consistent perspective to this particular organization. The rating scale provides five choices. Circle the number that best applies to each statement;

(1) If this person RARELY or SELDOM does what is described in the statement
(2) If this person does what is described ONCE IN A WHILE
(3) If this person SOMETIMES does what is described
(4) If this person OFTEN does what is described
(5) If this person VERY FREQUENTLY or ALMOST ALWAYS does what is described

In selecting the response, be realistic about the extent to which this person actually engages in the behavior. Do not answer in terms of how you would like to see this person or in terms of what this person should be doing. Answer in terms of how you typically behaves.

For example, the first statement is “He or she sets a personal example of what he or she expects from other people.” If you believe this person does this once in a while, circle the number 2. If you believe this person sets a personal example of what he or she expects form others fairly often, circle the number 4. Select and circle only one option (response number) for each statement.

Please respond to every statement. If you cannot respond to a statement (or feel that it does not apply), record a 1. When you have responded to all thirty statements, please turn to the response sheet on the back page and transfer your responses as instructed.

Copyright 2004 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.
## STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF

How frequently do you typically engage in the following behaviors and actions?
Circle the number to the right of each statement, using the scale below, that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RARELY OR Seldom</th>
<th>Once In A While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.

2. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.

3. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.

4. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.

5. I praise people for a job well done.

6. I spend time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed upon.

7. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.

8. I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.

9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.

10. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.

11. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.

12. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.

13. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.

14. I treat others with dignity and respect.

15. I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rarely or Seldom</th>
<th>Once in a While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I find ways to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get feedback about</td>
<td>the higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how my actions</td>
<td>purpose and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect other</td>
<td>meaning of what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people’s</td>
<td>we are doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I talk with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others about how</td>
<td>the way we can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own</td>
<td>do things in our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests can be</td>
<td>organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met by working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward a common</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When things do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not go as we</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected, I ask,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“What can we learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I support the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other people in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make on their own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I make it a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point to publicly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who show commit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment to our values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I build</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consensus on an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed-upon set of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values for our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am upbeat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and positive when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talking about what</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspires to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I make sure that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we set goals and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects we</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undertake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I give others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a great deal of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom and choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in deciding how</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to do their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I find ways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for us to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>celebrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I talk about the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values and principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that guide my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I speak with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conviction about the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher purpose and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning of what we</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I take</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiative in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimenting with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the way we can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do things in our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I provide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others to take on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I make sure that</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people in our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creatively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognized for their</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX F: STUDENT LPI- OBSERVER FORM

### STUDENT LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – OBSERVER

How frequently does this person typically engage in the following behaviors and actions? Circle the number to the right of each statement, using the scale below, that best applies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARELY OR Seldom</th>
<th>Once In a While</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He or She:

1. sets a personal example of what he or she expects from other people.
2. looks ahead and communicates about what he or she believes will affect us in the future.
3. looks around for ways to develop and challenge his or her skills and abilities.
4. fosters cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people he or she works with.
5. praises people for a job well done.
6. spends time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.
7. describes to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.
8. looks for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.
9. actively listens to diverse points of view.
10. encourages others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.
11. follows through on the promises and commitments he or she makes in this organization.
12. talks with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.
13. keeps current on events and activities that might affect our organization.
14. treats others with dignity and respect.
15. gives people in our organization support and expresses appreciation for their contributions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RARELY OR SELDOM</th>
<th>ONCE IN A WHILE</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN</th>
<th>FREQUENTLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He or She:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. finds ways to get feedback about how his or her actions affect other people's performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. talks with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. when things do not go as we expected, asks, “What can we learn from this experience?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. supports the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. makes it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. builds consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. is upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. makes sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. gives others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. finds ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. talks about the values and principles that guide his or her actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. speaks with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. takes initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. provides opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. makes sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX G: INSTRUCTIONS FOR TAKING THE L-BL ACHIEVING STYLES
ACHIEVING STYLES INVENTORY (ASI)
(ALL DATA ARE CONFIDENTIAL)

Please only complete the survey once.

1. Go to the Achieving Styles Institute home page by typing:
   www.achievingstyles.com

2. Click on Use an ASI Inventory online on the right side of the screen.

3. On the bottom of the next screen click on the first button: Use an inventory as part
   of a pre-paid group.

4. A dialogue box will appear: “Enter the username and password assigned to your
   group then click Login.”

   For “Username” type: XXXXXXX
   For “Password” type: XXXXXXX
   NOTE: both the Username and Password are in lower case font, and there are no
   spaces in either.

5. Then, click on the “Login” button.

6. On the next screen, click on Take the ASI under the box icon on the right side.

7. You may now complete the inventory starting with Section 1: Personal Datats--
   only your first and last names are required.

8. PLEASE NOTE: ALL THREE SECTIONS OF THE INSTRUMENT MUST BE
   COMPLETED IN ORDER FOR THE RESULTS TO BE ANALYZED. Section
   3: Demographic Data is information needed to study leadership and achieving
   styles. Two important questions are #9 and #12 about your occupation and
   employer’s industry. Please try to be as exact as possible on these questions, using
   the “lookup” utility next to each answer box. In Question 9, everyone please type
   in as full a job title as you can.

9. At the end of Section 3, Demographics, click on the button “Submit section 3.” If
   you accidentally did not answer a question, the program will prompt you to
   answer before you can exit.

10. On the next page is a button you can click to see your results right away. Your
    score, a polar graph of the organization’s rewarded achieving styles, and a brief
    explanation of the score will appear. You may print your results.

If you should experience any technical difficulties while completing this survey, please
contact Danita M. Brown at brownd9@ohio.edu or 740-593-4030.
The Inventory is split into three sections.
*The fields in blue are required to submit the inventory.

Section 1: Personal Data

*First name:

*Last name:

E-mail:

Street Address:

City:

State:

Zip/Postal Code:

Country:

Daytime Phone:

Section 2

The ASI Individual Leadership Inventory

Please respond to the following statements about your leadership styles. There are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers, nor any trick items and please select the answer that comes immediately to mind.

For each question, fill in the bubble which best describes how well the statement reflects your behavior.

There are forty-five questions in this inventory, split into groups of five. Finish each group, then click the ‘Next 5 Questions’ button.

Although the L-BL Achieving Styles Inventory can usually be completed in approximately ten minutes, 60 minutes are allowed for you to complete each section.

Please do not use the ‘Back’ or ‘Previous’ button in your browser. Your answers could be erased and the test may be corrupted and need to be re-taken from the start.
1. For me the most gratifying thing is to have solved a tough problem
2. I get to know important people in order to succeed
3. I achieve my goals through contributing to the success of others
4. For me, winning is the most important thing
5. When I want to achieve something, I look for assistance
6. I work hard to achieve so people will think well of me
7. I want to be the leader
8. More than anything else, I like to take on a challenging task
9. Faced with a task, I prefer a team approach to an individual one
10. I seek out leadership positions
11. Winning in competition is the most thrilling thing I can imagine
12. I feel the successes or failures of those close to me as if they were my own
13. I strive to achieve so that I will be well liked
14. The more competitive the situation, the better I like it
15. Real team effort is the best way for me to get a job done
16. I achieve by guiding others towards their goals
17. For me, the most exciting thing is working on a tough problem
18. I seek guidance when I have a task to accomplish
19. I have a sense of failure when those I care about do poorly
20. I develop some relationships with others to get what I need to succeed
21. I seek positions of authority
22. I am not happy if I don’t come out on top in a competitive situation
23. My way of achieving is by coaching others to their own success
24. For me, group effort is the most effective means to accomplishment
25. I look for support from others when undertaking a new task
26. I establish some relationships for the benefits they bring
27. I try to be successful at what I do so that I will be successful
28. I want to take charge when working with others
29. When a loved one succeeds, I also have a sense of accomplishment although I make no direct contribution
30. I strive to achieve in order to gain recognition
31. I look for reassurance from others when making decisions
32. For me, the greatest accomplishment is when the people I love achieve their goals
33. I go out of my way to work on challenging tasks
34. I succeed by taking an active part in helping others achieve success
35. I use my relationships with others to get things done
36. Working with others brings out my best efforts
37. I select competitive situations because I do better when I compete
38. Being the person in charge is exciting to me
39. I work to accomplish my goals to gain the admiration of others
40. I establish a relationship with one person in order to get to know others
41. My way of achieving is by helping others to learn how to get what they want
42. The accomplishments of others give me a feeling of accomplishments as well
43. For me, the greatest satisfaction comes from breaking through to the solution of a new problem
44. When I encounter a difficult problem, I go for help
45. My best achievements come from working with others

Section 3: Demographic Data

1. Sex: ○ Male ○ Female
2. Age:
3. Citizenship:
4. Race / Ethnicity:
   ○ American Indian
   ○ Black, not of Hispanic origin
   ○ Hispanic / Spanish
   ○ Alaskan Native
   ○ Asian or Pacific Islander
   ○ White, not of Hispanic Origin
5. Current Marital Status
6. Number of children you have
7. Completed years of Education
   (e.g., 12 = high school graduate)

Developed by Jean Lipman-Blumen, Alice Handley-Isaksen, and Harold J. Leavitt. Published by Achieving Styles Institute, Claremont, CA.
TO: CHAPTER/COUNCIL MEMBER
FROM: DANITA M. BROWN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CAMPUS LIFE
RE: FRATERNITY AND SORORITY LEADERSHIP INVENTORY
DATE: JANUARY 13, 2007

On January 5, 2007 you were given a packet of information that included information on the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI)-Observer. You were asked to complete this inventory on the behalf of your chapter or council president who was in office during fall quarter 2006 by Friday, January 12, 2007.

To date I have not received your results for the Student LPI-Observer. If you need another form please let me know as soon as possible. Please complete the inventory by Friday, January 19, 2007.

Again, all results of this study are confidential.

Thank you again for participating in this study.

Danita M. Brown
Associate Director, Campus Life
Baker University Center
Athens, Ohio 45701
(740) 593-4025
brownd9@ohio.edu
APPENDIX J: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Sample Questions

1. What is your definition of leadership?

2. How would you describe your leadership style?

3. Does gender make a difference in a person’s leadership style? Why or why not?

4. Think about your Student LPI- Self results, on which behavior did you score the highest? The lowest? Do you agree with the results? Why or why not?

5. Study the Student LPI-Observer scores for each of the five leadership practices. Consider both the practices and the specific behaviors associated with each one.
   a) In general, are the scores from your Observers most similar or different?
   b) On which practices do you agree? Disagree?

6. Think about your ASI results, does it reflect the way you accomplish goals and tasks within your chapter/council? Why or why not?

7. After reviewing all of your results, do you think you will change the way you lead? If so, how? If not, why?
APPENDIX K: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

First name: 

Last name: 

GPA: 

1. Sex: ○ Male ○ Female

2. Age: 

3. Race / Ethnicity: ○ American Indian ○ Alaskan Native ○ Black, not of Hispanic origin ○ Asian or Pacific Islander ○ Hispanic / Spanish ○ White, not of Hispanic Origin

4. Number of previous (before Fall 2006) leadership positions held (officer, chairperson, etc.):

5. Number of student organizations you belong to currently (Fall 2006 and after):

6. Number of current (Fall 2006 and after) leadership positions held (officer, chairperson, etc.):

7. Please respond to the following statement (circle your answer):

   During and since high school, I found myself in a leadership role:

   (1) Rarely
   (2) Once in a while
   (3) Sometimes
   (4) Fairly often
   (5) Frequently